

IZHAR-UL-HAQ

Part 3

Distortion and Abrogation in the Bible

The Trinity Refuted

Maulana M. Rahmatullah Kairanvi

IZHAR-UL-HAQ

Part 3

Distortion and Abrogation in the Bible

The Trinity Refuted

Maulana M. Rahmatullah Kairanvi

**TaHa Publishers Ltd.
1, Wynne Road
London SW9 0BB**

CONTENTS

© TaHa Publishers Ltd. 1410/ MARCH 1990

Published by: TaHa Publishers Ltd.

1 Wynne Road
London SW9 0BB
United Kingdom

Translated by: Muhammad Wali Raazi

Footnotes: Justice Sheikh Muhammad Taqi Usmani

Editing and Production by Bookwork, Norwich

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in any retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any
means, electronic or otherwise, without written permission of the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Karanvi, M.I. Rahamattla, 1834-

Izhar al haq.

Pt. 3

1. Islam.. Apologetics, history

I. Title

297'.29

ISBN 0-907461-78-6

Printed and bound in Great Britain at
Southampton Book Co., Southampton

The Arguments	1
Distortions	2
The Admissions of Christian Scholars	4
The Opinion of the <i>Encyclopaedia Britannica</i>	6
The <i>Rees Encyclopaedia</i>	6
Watson's Admission	8
Beausobre and Lenfant's Opinion	11
The Views of Christian Scholars on the Pentateuch	12
The Epistle of James and the Book of Revelation	14
The Admission of Clement	15
Admissions of Protestant Scholars	20
Admissions of German Scholars	22
Views on the Subject of the Chronicles	29
The Muslim Attitude towards the Gospels	30
The Opinion of Muslim Scholars	36
The Opinion of Imam ar-Razi	36
The Opinion of Imam al-Qurtubi	36
The Opinion of al-Maqrizi	38
Two Claims to the Authenticity of the Gospels	41
Answer to the First Claim	41
The Source of Clement's Letter	42
The Second Passage of Clement's Letter	45
The Third Passage of Clement	46
The Letters of Ignatius	49
The Canons of Nicaea	56
Answer to the Second Claim	57
The Gospel of Luke was not seen by Paul	58
Human Distortion of the Bible	60
Alterations in the Text of the Bible	60
Additions to the Text of the Bible	83

Omissions in the Text of the Bible	116
Refutation of Misleading Protestant Statements	137
First Contention	137
Observations of Non-Christian Scholars	138
Observations of Heretical Christian Scholars	142
Observations of Christian Theologians	144
Second Contention	163
The Missing Books of the Old Testament	165
Varied Opinions on the Truth of Some Books of the Bible	171
Third Contention	175
Fourth Contention	175
Historicity of the Bible	177
The Ancient Versions of the Bible	188
Abrogation in the Bible	193
The False Nature of the Biblical Changes	194
Biblical Examples of the First Kind of Abrogation	196
Conclusions	211
The Second Kind of Abrogation in the Bible	213
The Innovation of the Trinity	222
The Trinity of Trial	253
Interpretation of Biblical Verses	258
The Trinity Refuted by Christ Himself	260
Christian Arguments in favour of the Trinity	272
A Debate between Imam Raazi and a Priest	283

THE BIBLICAL TEXTS ARE THEY REVEALED?

THE ARGUMENTS

We intend to show in this chapter that the Judaeo-Christian claim that the Bible, - both Old and New Testaments, was revealed to and written down by men inspired by God, is false and ungrounded. There are numerous arguments to prove this, but we will confine ourselves in the following pages to seventeen of them which, in our opinion, are more than sufficient to prove our claim.

DISTORTIONS

A large number of clear contradictions are to be found in the books of the Bible. The Christian scholars and commentators have always been at a loss to find any way of explaining them. For some of the textual differences they have had to admit that one of the texts is correct and the other false, due either to deliberate distortion on the part of later theologians or to mistakes of the copiers. For some contradictory texts they have put forward absurd explanations that would never be accepted by a sensible reader. These have already been discussed.

The Biblical books are full of errors and we have pointed out more than one hundred of them already. It is self-evident that a revealed text must be free from errors and contradictions.

There are also many cases of distortion and human manipulation in the texts of these books. The alterations and changes which have been deliberately or unknowingly made have even been admitted by Christian theologians. Texts which have been definitely changed or distorted cannot be accepted as revealed or inspired even by the Christians. We intend to present a hundred examples of such distortions in the Bible later in this book.

As we mentioned previously, certain books or part of books are accepted by the Catholics as being the revelations of their Prophets while the Protestants have proved that these books were not divinely inspired. These books are: the Book of Baruch, the Book of Tobit, the Book of Judith, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Maccabees I and II, chapters eleven to sixteen of the Book of Esther, and ten verses from chapter ten of the same book, and the song of the three children from chapter three of the Book of Daniel.

These books are considered by the Catholics to be an integral part of the Old Testament, whereas the Protestants have rejected them and do not include them in the Old Testament. We, therefore, leave them out of our discussion. Any readers particularly curious about these books should refer to the books of the Protestant scholars. The Jews do not accept these books as genuine either.

Similarly, the third Book of Ezra is considered part of the Old Testament according to the Greek church, while both the Catholics and the Protestants have proved conclusively that this book is not genuine. The revealed status of the Book of Judges is also in question for those who claim it to be written by Phineas or Hezekiah, and the same applies to the Book of Ruth, according to those who perceive it as being written by Hezekiah. Nor, according to the majority of writers, is the Book of Nehemiah divinely inspired, especially the first twenty-six verses of chapter twelve.

The Book of Job was also not considered revelation by Maimonides, Michel, Semler, Stock, Theodore and Luther, the founder of the Protestant faith. The same opinion is held by those who attribute this book to Elihu or to someone unknown. Chapters thirty and thirty-one of the Book of Proverbs are not divinely inspired. According to the Talmud, Ecclesiastes is not an inspired book.

The same applies to the Song of Solomon according to Theodore, Simon, Leclerc, Whiston, Sewler, and Castellio. Twenty-seven chapters of the Book of Isaiah are also not revelation according to the learned scholar Lefèvre d'Étapas of Germany. The Gospel of Matthew, according to the majority of ancient scholars and almost all later scholars who consider it to have been originally written in the Hebrew language and that the present Gospel is merely a translation of the original which has been lost, is not, and cannot be, divinely inspired.

As for the Gospel of John, the scholars, Bretschneider and Lefèvre d'Étapas have refused to accept it as genuine. The last chapter was certainly rejected by the scholar Grotius as being neither genuine or inspired.

Similarly all the Epistles of John are not accepted as prophetic by Bretschneider and the *Alogi* school. The Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of Jude, the Epistle of James, the First and Second Epistles of John and the Book of Revelations are not considered as genuine by most of the scholars.

Horne says on page 131 of Vol. I of his commentaries printed in 1822:

If we accept that some books of the Prophets have been lost and have disappeared, we shall have to believe that those books were never written with the help of inspiration. St. Augustine proved this fact with very strong arguments saying that he had found many things mentioned in the books of the kings of Judea and Israel, but could not find any description of the things in these books. For their explanations, they have referred to the books of other Prophets, and in some instances they have also mentioned the names of the Prophets. These books have not been included in the canon acknowledged by the church, which has not assigned any reason for their exclusion, except to say that the Prophets, to whom significant religious instructions are revealed, have two kinds of writings. Writings without inspiration, which are similar to the writings of honest historians, and writings guided by inspiration. The first kind of writings are attributed to the Prophets themselves, while the others are ascribed directly to God. The first kind of writings are meant to add to our knowledge while the others are the source of the law and religious instructions.

Further on page 133 of Vol. I, discussing the cause of the disappearance of the Book of Wars of the Lord, mentioned in the Book of Numbers¹ (21:14), he said:

The book which has disappeared was, according to the great scholar Dr. Lightfoot's findings, the one that was written for the guidance of Joshua, under the command of the Lord after the defeat of the Amalekites. It seems that the book in question contained some accounts of the victory of this war

1. There is a description given in the Book of Numbers with reference to the Book of Wars of the Lords. Only some sentences from that book have been given, the rest of the book has been lost.

as well as strategic instructions for the future wars. This was not an inspired book nor was it a part of the Canonical books.

Then in the supplement of his first volume he said:

When it is said that the Holy books were revealed by God, it does not necessarily signify that every word and the whole text was revealed. The difference of idiom and expression of the authors show that they were allowed to write according to their own temperament and understanding. The knowledge of inspiration was used by them similar to the use of the current sciences. It cannot be imagined that every word they said or every doctrine they passed was revealed to them by God.

Further he said that it was confirmed that the writers of the books of the Old Testament were "sometimes inspired".

The compilers of Henry and Scott's Commentary, in the last volume of their book, quote from the Alexander Canon, that is, from the principles of faith laid down by Alexander:

It is not necessary that everything said by a Prophet should be an inspiration or a part of the Canon. Because Solomon wrote some books through inspiration it does not mean that everything he wrote was inspired by God. It should be known that the Prophets and the disciples of Jesus were sometimes inspired for important instructions.

Alexander's Canon is held as a book worthy of great respect and trust in the eyes of the Protestants. Warn, a great scholar of the Protestants, has used arguments from this book in his discursive examination of the authenticity of the Bible.

THE OPINION OF ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA

The author's entry "Inspiration"¹ in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*² has this statement on page 274 vol. 11

It has always been a matter of controversy whether everything which is written in the sacred books is inspired or not. Similarly all accounts of the events described in them are not inspired by God according to Jerome, Grotius, Papias and many other scholars.

Further in vol. 19 on page 20 it says:

Those who claim that everything of the Gospels is inspired by God cannot prove their claim easily.

It also says:

If ever we are asked which part of the Old Testament is held by us as inspiration of God, we would answer that the doctrines and the predictions for future events which are the foundation of Christian faith cannot be other than inspiration. As for other descriptions, the memory of the apostles is enough for them.

THE REES ENCYCLOPEDIA

In volume nineteen of the *Rees Encyclopedia*, the author says that

1. We did not find this sentence in the present edition of *Britannica*, however, we have found the admission that every word of these books is not inspired, on page 23 vol. 12 under the entry "Inspiration"

2. All the references in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* have been taken from the old 18th century edition. The present edition does not have been them at the places referred to. We have therefore translated them from Urdu in our own words. This however, does not make difference as this admission can be found in many place in the *Britannica*. (Raazi)

the authenticity and divinity of the Holy books has been debated because there are many contradictions and inconsistencies found in the statements of the authors of these books. For example, when the texts of Matthew 10:19,20 and Mark, 11:13 are compared with Acts 23:1-6,¹ the contradictory nature of these books becomes all the more serious.

It is also said that the disciples of Jesus themselves did not know one another to be receiving inspiration from God, as is evident from their debates in the council of Jerusalem and from Paul's blaming of Peter. Moreover it is clear that the ancient Christians did not consider them innocent and free from faults, since they sometimes made them subject to their criticism. This is obvious from Acts 11:2,3² and also Acts 21:20-24.

It has also been mentioned that Paul, who considered himself not less than the disciples of Jesus (see 2 Corinthians 11:5 and 12:11), nevertheless mentioned himself in such a manner as to show that he did not feel himself constantly to be a man of inspiration.³ The author also said:

We are not given a feeling by the disciples of Jesus as speaking on behalf of God every time they spoke.

He has said that:

Michaelis thoroughly examined the arguments of both the groups, which was necessary for a matter of such importance, and decided that the presence of inspiration in the Holy Book is certainly of great use, but even if we dispense with the presence of inspiration in the Gospels and the Acts, which are books of an historical nature, we lose nothing and they still remain as useful to us as before. It does not damage anything

1. This difference of the texts has been discussed by us, under the errors Nos: 98-100.

2. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, Saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them. (Acts 11:2,3)

3. I Corinthians 7:10,12,15,40. And also 2 Cor. 11:17.

if we accept that the historical descriptions of the evangelists in the gospels, are similar to the descriptions of the historians, since, as was observed by Christ, "And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." John 15:27.

It is therefore unnecessary to prove the truth of these books to a non-Christian, on the basis of his acceptance of the truth of some of the evangelic descriptions. On the contrary you should put forward arguments in favour of such miracles as the death and resurrection of Christ as related in the writings of the evangelists, always bearing in mind that they are historians. For anyone who wishes to examine the foundation and origin of his faith, it is necessary to consider the statements of the evangelist about those particular matters as similar to the statements of other historians. Because it would be physically impossible to prove the truth of the events described by them, it is necessary that we accept their descriptions in the manner we accept the descriptions of other historians. This line of approach would save Christianity from all dangers. We do not find it mentioned anywhere that the general events experienced by the apostles, and perceived by Luke through his investigations, were inspired.

If however we are allowed to admit that some evangelists made mistakes and that they were later corrected by John, this would be greatly advantageous and facilitate conformity in the Bible. Mr. Cuddle also favored the opinion of Michaelis in section 2 of his book. As far as the books written by the pupils of the apostles are concerned, like the Gospels of Mark and Luke and the Book of Acts, Michaelis has not given his decision as to whether they were inspired or not.

WATSON'S ADMISSION

Watson, in volume four of his book on Revelations, which was based on the commentary of Dr. Benson, remarks that the fact that Luke's writing is not inspired is evident from the dedication of his

Gospel to Theophilus:

Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.¹

Watson says about this:

The ancient writers of Christian theology have also given a similar opinion. Irenaeus said that Luke conveyed to us the things which he learnt from the apostles. Jerome said that Luke does not depend only on Paul, who was never in the physical company of Christ. Luke also acquired the knowledge of the Evangel from other apostles as well.

He further elucidates:

The apostles, when they used to speak or write anything concerning the faith, were protected with the treasure of inspiration that they had. Being, however, human beings, and men of reason and inspiration, they were just like other people when describing common events.

This made it possible for Paul to write in his first epistle to Timothy, without inspiration:

Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities.²

1. Luke 1:1-4.
2. I Tim. 5:23.

and further:

The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments.¹

And that he could write to Philemon, "But withal prepare me also a lodging." (v.22) And as he wrote to Timothy, "Erastus abode at Corinth; but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick."²

However there are other occasions when it is clear that Paul speaks by inspiration, as in his first letter to the Corinthians:

And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord,
Let not the wife depart from her husband.³

But in verse twelve of the same epistle he says:

But to the rest speak I, not the Lord.

Then in verse twenty-five he says:

Now concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful.

The book of Acts contains this statement:

Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia. After they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not.

From the above we are given to understand that the apostles' work

-
1. 2 Tim 4:13.
 2. 2 Tim. 4:20.
 3. 1 Cor. 7:10.
 4. Acts 16:6,7.

was based on two things: reason and inspiration. They used the first to speak of general events, while through the other they gave religious instructions related to the Christian faith. This is why the apostles, like other human beings, committed mistakes in their domestic affairs and in their intentions. This is quite evident from Acts 23:3; Rom. 15:24,28; 1 Cor. 16:5,6,8 and 2-Cor. 11:15-18.

The nineteenth volume of the *Rees Encyclopedia* contains this description under the entry "Dr. Benson":

Whatever he has written in connection with inspiration seems to be clear and logical and, indeed, unique in its application.

BEAUSOBRE AND LENFANT'S OPINION

Beausobre and Lenfant said the following about this matter:

The Holy Ghost, with whose help and teaching the evangelists and the apostles wrote, did not prescribe any particular language for them, but conveyed the meanings to their hearts through intuition and protected them from being involved in errors. They were allowed to preach or write the word of inspiration in their own language using their own expressions. As we find differences of expression and idiom in the writings of the ancient writers, which are mainly dependent on the temperaments and capabilities of the writers concerned, so an expert of the original language will easily recognise the differences of idiom and expression in the gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John and the epistles of Paul.

If, however, the Holy Ghost had truly inspired the words to them, this would have not happened. The style and expression of all the gospels would have been identical. Besides, there have been many events the description of which does not require inspiration. For example, they write of many events which they saw with their own eyes or heard from reliable observers. Luke says that when he intend-

ed to write his gospel he wrote the descriptions according to eye witnesses of the events described. Having this knowledge in his mind, he thought that it was a treasure which should be conveyed to future generations.

An author who received his account through the inspiration of the Holy Ghost usually expressed this fact by saying something to the effect that everything he had written was according to inspiration he had received from the Holy Ghost. Though the faith of Paul is of an unusual kind, it is still strange that Luke does not seem to have any witnesses except Paul and his companions.

We have produced above the testimony of two of the great scholars of Christianity, who are very much esteemed and celebrated in the Christian world. Horne and Watson have also the same opinion of them.

THE VIEWS OF CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS ON THE PENTATEUCH

Horne said on page seven hundred and ninety-eight of volume two of his great work:

Eichhorn, one of the German scholars, denied that Moses received inspiration.

And on page eight hundred and eighteen:

Scholz, Noth, Rosenmüller and Dr. Geddes are of the opinion that Moses did not receive inspiration, and that all the five books of the Pentateuch were simply a collection of verbal traditions current in that period. This concept is making its way rapidly among the German scholars.

He also said:

Eusebius and several latter theologians have pronounced

that the book of Genesis was written by Moses, in Midian, when he was pasturing the goats of his father in law.

We may be allowed to remark that, in this case, this book cannot be an inspiration because, according to Eusebius, this was before Moses was entrusted with prophethood. Therefore the book of Genesis also must be a collection of current local verbal traditions. If the writings of the Prophets, written by them as Prophets, were not books of inspiration, a fact admitted by Horne and other scholars, how then could a book written by Moses long before his prophethood be a revealed book?

The Catholic, Ward, has on page thirty-eight of the 1841 edition:

Luther said in vol. 3 of his book on pages 40 and 41 that: 'Neither do we hear Moses, nor do we turn to him, for he was only for the Jews; we have nothing to do with him.'

In another book he said: 'We believe neither in Moses nor in the Torah, because he was an enemy of Jesus, and said that he was the master of executioners, and said that the Christians have nothing to do with the ten commandments.'

Again he said that he would discard the Ten Commandments from the books so that heresy was abolished forever, because these are the root of all heretical ideas.

One of his pupils, Aslibius, has said that no one knew the ten commandments in the churches. The Christian sect called the Antinomians was initiated by a person who believed that the Pentateuch did not have any such qualities as to be considered the word of God. It was their belief that any one committing sins like adultery and other evil deeds deserved salvation and would be in eternal happiness if only he had faith in Christianity. Those who turned to the ten commandments were influenced by Satan, and they were the ones who crucified Jesus.

These remarks of the founder of the Protestant faith and his pupil are certainly of great importance. They mean that all Protestants must be disbelievers in Moses and the Pentateuch, since, according to

them, Moses was the enemy of Jesus, the master of the executioners, and the Pentateuch was not the word of God. Having nothing to do with the ten commandments, they must turn to paganism and multi-theism. They should also disregard their parents, trouble their neighbours, commit theft, murder and perjury because, otherwise, they would be acting according to the ten commandments which "are the root of all heretical ideas".

Some Christians belonging to this sect have said to us that they did not believe in Moses as a Prophet but only as a man of wisdom and a great legislator, while some others said to us that Moses, God forbid, was a thief and a robber. We asked them to fear God, they answered that they were right in saying this as it had been said by Jesus himself:

All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not hear them.¹

Now we can see why the founder of the Protestant faith, Luther, and his pupil reproached Moses; they must have been guided by the above statement.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES AND THE BOOK OF REVELATION

Luther said regarding the epistle of James:

This is the word not suitable to be included in the books, as the disciple James said in chapter five of his epistle, "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord."²

Luther, raising objection on the above statement, said in volume

1. John 10:8.
2. James 5:14.

two of his book:

If this is what James has said, I answer him that no disciple has the right to define and issue religious injunctions on his own account, because it was only Jesus who possessed that status.

It is clear from the above that the epistle of James is not, according to Luther, inspired, and that injunctions given by the disciples are not supported by inspiration, otherwise the above statement would be absurd and meaningless.

Ward stated in his book printed in 1841:

Pomran, an eminent scholar of the Protestants and a pupil of Luther, says that James has written false and absurd events at the end of his letter. He has copied from other books events which cannot be associated with the Holy Ghost. Such a book therefore must not be considered as inspired.

Vitus Theodore, a Protestant preacher in Nuremberg, said that they had intentionally given up the Book of Revelation and the Epistle of James. He said that the Epistle of James is not to be censured where he has stressed the necessity of good deeds along with faith, but that this letter contains contradictions. *The Magdeburg Centuries* said that the Epistle of James, at one place, is unique among all the accounts of the disciples because he says that salvation does not depend on faith alone but that it also requires good deeds. He also says that the Torah was the Law of Freedom.

It is clear from the above that these elders, like Luther, do not believe in the Epistle of James being inspired by the Holy Ghost.

THE ADMISSION OF CLEMENT

Clement said:

Matthew and Mark are different from each other in their writings, but when they agree on a certain point they are preferred to Luke's account.

We may be allowed to say that the above statement allows us to deduce two important points. Firstly that Matthew and Mark themselves differ in many places in their accounts of the same event and whenever they agree in their statement their accounts are preferable to Luke. None of them ever agree word for word about any event. Secondly that all three gospels are proved to have been written without inspiration because the preference of the first two gospels over the third would be out of the question had they been inspired.

Paley, an eminent Protestant scholar, wrote a book concerning the truth of the four gospels. It was printed in 1850. He writes on page 323 of his book to this effect:

The second thing that has been falsely attributed to the ancient Christians is that they firmly believed in the coming of the Day of Judgment in their own time. I will present an example before any objection to this is raised. Jesus said to Peter, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" This statement has been taken to mean that John would not die until the Day of Judgment, and this false concept spread among the common people. Now if this report was conveyed to us after it had become a public opinion and the cause which initiated the mistake is not known, and someone comes forward to present it as an argument against the Christian faith this would be absolutely unfair, in view of the facts that we possess.

Those who say that the gospels lead us to believe that the early Christians truly expected that the Last Day would come about in their own time should keep this explanation in mind, and it will save them from the blame of deceiving people. Now there comes another question that if, for a moment, we accept the possibility of errors and omissions on the part of the disciples, how then can they be trusted about anything they say? As a reply to this question it would be enough for the supporters of Christianity to say to the disbelievers that

what we seek from the disciples is their witness not their personal opinion. The object, in fact, is to achieve the result which, as a consequence of this, is safe.

But in answering this, we must keep two points in mind; to eliminate all the dangers. First, the object intended by the mission of all the disciples should be defined. They helped prove the point which was either strange or mixed with truth. They are not required to say anything about what is obviously not related to the faith, but they would be required to say something to remove ambiguity about something in the text of the divine books which has accidentally got mixed up with the truth. Another example of this is the belief in the possession by devils. In the case of those who hold that this false opinion had become common in their time and also influenced the evangelists and the early Christians, it must be accepted that this opinion does not in anyway damage the truth of the Christian faith, because this is not the matter Jesus was sent for. But something which, having become a public opinion in that country, somehow got mixed with the statement of Jesus.

It is certainly not a part of their message to rectify their false belief in the spirits, nor has it anything to do with their witness. Secondly their message should be separated and distinguished from what they present to support and elucidate that which is inspired. For instance, something in what they say might be inspired, but in addition to that they present personal explanations to strengthen their message. For example, the principle that anyone other than a Jew accepting the Christian faith would not be bound to follow the law of Moses, in spite of its truth having been proved through miracles.

Paul, for example, when speaking of this principle, has mentioned many things in support of it. Therefore the principle in itself is acknowledged by us, but it is not necessary for us to support all their explanatory remarks in order to prove the truth of the Christian faith. This method may be applied to other principles of a similar nature. I am absolutely sure of the truth that any instruction agreed upon by the pious men of God will always be followed as a religious obligation. It is,

however, not necessary for us to explain or to accept all those details, unless they have, of course, specified those premises.

The above passage allows us to advance the following four points:

1. We have already proved through sufficient arguments and supports, under the heading of Errors no. 64-78, that all the disciples of Jesus and other Christians of that time had firm belief in the coming of the Day of Judgment in their own time and that John would not die until the Day of Judgment.

We have reproduced their unambiguous and definite statements to this effect. Barnes, making his comments on chapter twenty-one of the Gospel of John, said the words which we reproduce below from the Urdu translation:

The misconception that John would not die was created by the words of Jesus which can be easily misunderstood. The idea became even stronger with the fact that John survived until after the death of the other disciples.

The compilers of Henry and Scott remark:

Most probably the purpose of Jesus by this statement was to annoy the Jews, but the disciples misunderstood it to signify that John would live up to the Last Day or that he would be raised to heaven alive.

Further they say:

Here we must keep in mind that a report of a certain man may come without proper confirmation. It would, therefore be a folly to base our faith on such reports. This statement, in spite of being a report of the disciples and having become common and established among people, turned out to be untrue. How then could reports which were not even written down and recorded demand our belief. These are our own comments and not a statement made by Jesus.

Further they say in their marginal notes:

The disciples misunderstood the words of Jesus, as the evangelist¹ has elucidated, because they had firm belief that the coming of the Lord would be for establishing Justice.

In view of the above statements, there remains no doubt that the disciples misunderstood it. Now, when they had such beliefs regarding the Day of Judgment and John not dying until the day of Judgment, their statement with regard to the occurrence would naturally be taken literally which proves them to have been wrong and to find new explanations for them is of no avail. That would involve an effort to give the words a meaning which was not intended by their speakers. Having been proved to have been other than the truth they obviously cannot be taken as inspirations.

2. It is clear from the above description of Paley that the scholars have admitted the fact that the matters which are not directly related to the faith, or have been somehow mixed with the principles of faith, do not damage the Christian faith in any way if they are proved erroneous.

3. They have also admitted that the presence of errors and mistakes in the arguments of the disciples is not damaging to the Christian faith.

4. They have accepted that the existence of evil spirits and their influence on human beings is not a reality and that belief in them was a product of human imagination and superstition; and that they had found their way in through the statements of the evangelists, and even through Jesus, because they had become a part of common tradition of that period.

1. This refers to John, 21:23. "Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die."

Keeping these four conclusions in mind, we must be allowed to claim that more than fifty percent of the gospels are thus precluded from having been the result of inspiration. According to this opinion, only the descriptions directly related to faith or those defining the rituals can be considered as inspired.

However this opinion does not carry any weight because it happens to be against the opinion of Luther, the founder of the Protestant church, who explicitly declared that none of the apostles had any right to issue or define any religious principle on his own account, because only Jesus had the right to issue religious doctrines. The unavoidable conclusion is that the remaining part of the gospels, consisting of the descriptions from the disciples directly related to faith, is likewise deprived of its Divine character.

ADMISSIONS OF PROTESTANT SCHOLARS

Ward reproduced a number of statements from the great scholars of the Protestant faith. We reproduce below nine of them from his book printed in 1841.

- (1) Zwingli, a Protestant bibliographer, said that all the events described in Paul's letters cannot be considered sacred, as some events described in these epistles are incorrect.
- (2) Mr. Fulk accused Peter of making false statements and declared him to be ignorant of the Evangel.
- (3) Dr. Goad, during a polemic with Father Campion, said that Peter was wrong in his belief about the descent of the Holy Spirit on Jesus.
- (4) Brentius, called a learned leader and master by Jewel, said that Peter the chief disciple and Barnabas made erroneous statements after the descent of the Holy Spirit.

- (5) John Calvin remarked that Peter spread heresy in the church and put the independence of Christianity in danger and the Christian grace was led astray by him.
- (6) *The Magdeburg Centuries* accuses the disciples, and especially Paul, of making false statements.
- (7) Whittaker said that the people and dignitaries of the church, and even the disciples of Jesus, made great mistakes in preaching the Christian faith to the gentiles, and that Peter made mistakes in rituals, and that these mistakes were committed by them after the descent of the Holy Spirit.
- (8) Zanchius gave an account of some followers of Calvin in his book. He reported that some of them said that if Paul ever came to Geneva to preach against Calvin, they would listen to Calvin and leave Paul alone.
- (9) Lewathrus, a staunch follower of Luther, giving a description of some great scholars has quoted their statements to the effect that it was possible for them to doubt a statement of Paul, but there was no room for any doubt about the statements made by Luther. Similarly it was not possible for them to allow of any doubt in the book of the church of Augsburg concerning the principles of faith.

The above statements are from the great scholars of the Protestant faith. They have declared that none of the books of the New Testament were inspired and genuine. They have also admitted that the disciples were erratic in what they wrote.

ADMISSIONS OF GERMAN SCHOLARS

The learned scholar Norton wrote a book on the truth of the Bible which was printed in Boston in 1837. He said in his preface to the book:

Eichhorn observed in his book that, in the first days of the Christianity, there was a short book consisting of various accounts of Jesus' life. It is quite possible to say that this was the original Evangel. Most probably this was written for those followers who could not listen to the sayings of Jesus and could not see him with their own eyes. This Evangel was a model. The accounts of Jesus written there were not in chronological order.

It must be noted that this script was different from the present gospels in many respects. The present gospels are by no means the model represented by the one discussed above. The present gospels were written under very difficult circumstances and contain some accounts of Jesus which were not present in the original script. There is evidence to suggest that this original script was the main source of all the gospels which appeared in the first two centuries after the death of Jesus. It also served as the basis for the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke which later on became more popular than the others. Though these three gospels also contained additions and omissions, they were later on supplemented with the missing events by other people to make them complete. The other gospels, which contained various accounts of Jesus occurring after his prophethood, such as the Gospel of Marcion and the Gospel of Tatian were abandoned. They also added many other accounts, accounts of Jesus' birth and also accounts of his youth and reaching maturity and other things. This fact is evident from the gospel called the Memoirs from which Justin quoted in his book. The same is understood from the gospel of Corinth.

The portions of these gospels which are still available, if compared with each other, clearly show that the addition of these accounts has

been quite gradual, for example, the heavenly voice which was heard originally spoke in these words:

Thou art my son, I have begotten thee this day.

As has been quoted by Justinian in two places. Clement also reproduced this sentence from a Gospel of unknown identity in these words:

Thou art my beloved son, I have begotten thee this day.

The present gospels, however, have this sentence in these words:

Thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased.¹

The Ebionite Gospel combined the two statements together thus:

Thou art my beloved son, I am pleased unto thee, thou art begotten this day.

This was stated by Epiphanius.

Christian history, through gradual additions and innumerable manipulations, has totally lost its original form and is now a mixture of unidentifiable ingredients. Any one curious enough can easily satisfy his curiosity by reading an account of Jesus' baptism that has been collected together from several gospels.

This gradual mixture of contra-factual events with original scripture has so terribly deformed the authenticity of the gospels that they no longer retain their original divine character. The more they were translated from one language to another, the more they lost their original shape and form.

Realising this situation, the Church came to their aid towards the end of the second century or at the beginning of the third century AD

1. Mark 1:11.

and tried to save the true and the original Evangel and to convey, as far as possible, the truth to the future generations. They, therefore, selected the four present gospels out of many gospels that were current in that period, because these four scripts seemed more comprehensible than any of the others.

There is no sign of the existence of the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke before the end of the second century or the beginning of the third century AD. The first man to speak of these gospels in history was Irenaeus in 200 AD who also advanced some arguments concerning the number of the gospels.

Then in 216 AD Clement of Alexandria made a painstaking effort to prove that these four gospels were inspired and, therefore, should be acknowledged as the source of Christian faith. The result of this is that, towards the end of the second century and the beginning of the third, the Church made serious efforts to get these four gospels acknowledged, in spite of the fact that they did not deserve this acknowledgement since they are clearly not genuine in all respects. The Church also tried hard to convince people to discard all other existing gospels.

Had the Church devoted this serious effort to purifying the original script found by the early preachers, it would have been a great contribution towards the future generations. But perhaps it was not possible for the Church to do so since none of the existing gospels was free from additions and alterations, and there was no way of distinguishing the right from the wrong. Eichhorn further said in the footnotes to his book:

Many early theologians had doubts about several parts of these gospels, but they were not able to put forward any corrections to them.

He also said:

In our times, printing facilities have made it impossible for people to distort and manipulate the text of a certain book. Before the invention of printing the conditions differed from

those of today. It was possible for the owner of a certain version to insert distortions and additions into the book, which then became the source for all subsequent copies, leaving no means for them to ascertain which parts of the book were from the author and which had been added or changed. Subsequently these corrupted copies became common among the people.

You will find that many saints and theologians complained that the copiers and the owners of the copies of these books distorted the texts shortly after they were written. The script of Dionysius was distorted even before it was circulated. You also find that there were complaints of impurities being inserted into the books by the followers of Satan who were said to have excluded certain things and included certain others on their own account. In the view of these witnesses it is clear that the Holy Scriptures did not remain safe and intact. This in spite of the fact that it was quite difficult for the people of that period to distort the texts as the authors of that period used to issue heavy curses and make sworn oaths in order to discourage people from daring to make changes in them.

The same also happened with the history of Jesus, otherwise Celsus would have not felt it necessary to point out the changes and distortions that had been made by the Christians in their texts. That is how some sentences regarding certain accounts of Jesus, which were scattered in several gospels, came to be combined together in a single gospel. For example, the Ebionite Gospel gives a complete account of the baptism of Jesus which has been compiled from things found scattered in all of the first three gospels and in the memoirs from which, according to Epiphanius,¹ Justin quoted.

In another place Eichhorn said:

Manipulations in the sacred texts, in the form of additions and omissions and the replacement of a word by its synonym, by those who lacked the necessary scholastic aptitude, is his-

1. A pagan scholar of the second century AD.

torically traceable right from the time of the appearance of the gospels. This is not surprising since, from the beginning of the history of the Christianity, it has been a common habit of writers to make changes according to their own whims, particularly in the sermons of Jesus and the accounts of events in his life which were preserved by them. This procedure, initiated in the first era of Christian history, continued to be followed by the people of later centuries. In the second century AD, this habitual distortion in the texts had become so commonly known to the people that even the opponents of the Christian faith were aware of it. Celsus, as noted above, raised objections against the Christians that, they had changed their texts more than three or four times, and these changes were not of a superficial nature but done in such a manner that the subjects and meanings of the gospels were altogether changed. Clement also pointed out that at the end of the second century AD there were some people who used to tamper with the texts of the gospels. He has specified that the sentence, "For theirs is the kingdom of heaven,"¹ was changed in some versions to, "They shall be perfect." Some others even made it read: "They shall attain a place where they shall see no trouble."

Norton, having quoted the above statement by Eichhorn said:

No one thinks that Eichhorn is alone in this opinion, because no other book is as popular in Germany as the book of Eichhorn, and it is considered to be in accordance with the opinions of most of the modern writers with regard to the gospels, and the same applies to matters which cast doubt upon the truth of the gospels.

Since Norton is known as an advocate of the gospels, having quoted the above statements of Eichhorn, he refutes them all in favour of the gospels, but, as will be evident to any reader of his book, his arguments are not convincing. In spite of all this, he had to admit openly

1. Matt. 5:10.

that the following seven portions of the New Testament are definitely not from those who are considered to be their authors, and had been added later.

1. He says on page 53 of his book that the first two chapters of Matthew were not written by him.
2. On page 63 he says that the event of Judas Iscariot¹ contained in Matt. 27:3-10 is certainly a false statement and was added later on.
3. Similarly he declared that verses 52 and 53 of chapter 27 of Matthew are a later addition.²
4. It appears on page 70 that verses 9-20 of chapter 16 of Mark are a later invention.³
5. On page 89 he says that verses 43 and 44 of chapter 22 of Luke are a later addition.⁴
6. On page 84 he points out that verses 3, and 4 of chapter 5 of the Gospel of John, are a later addition. That is from, "Waiting for the moving of the water..." to, "...was made whole of whatsoever disease he had."

1. The event of his hanging himself after the arrest of Jesus and selling his land for thirty pieces of silver.

2. This refers to a description of raising the dead saints from the graves after the death of Jesus.

3. These verses contain the description of the resurrection of Jesus which contains a number of errors.

4. This refers to the visit of Jesus to the Mount of Olives a night before his crucifixion. It reads, "And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground." (Luke 22:43 and 44) Home, however, has confirmed the correctness of this verse and has opposed the opinion which advocates excluding it from the books. We have discussed this verse in detail later in the book.

7. On page 88 he specifies that verses 24 and 25 of chapter 21 of the Gospel of John are certainly later additions.¹

Further on page 610 he says:

The miraculous events described by Luke have been mixed with traditional untruths and poetic exaggeration by the scribes. But it is very difficult in this age to separate the truth from falsifications. Any statement containing traditional untruths and poetic exaggeration is obviously very far from being an inspiration.

We may be allowed to draw the following four conclusions from the above statement of Eichhorn which has also been favoured by other German scholars.

1. The original Evangel has become extinct from the world.
2. The present gospels are a mixture of true and false descriptions.
3. The text of these gospels has been distorted and changed by the people of different times. Celsus tried hard to inform the world that the Christians had changed their texts three or four times or more, to the extent that they had actually changed the subject matter of these texts.
4. The present gospels did not show any signs of existence before the end of the second century and the beginning of the third century AD.

Scholars such as Leclerc, Koppe, Michael, Lessing, Niemeyer and Manson agree with regard to our first conclusion, because they have all said that perhaps Matthew, Mark and Luke might have had the same copy in the Hebrew language of a document containing an account of the life of Christ. Matthew borrowed most of the contents

¹. These verses contain greatly exaggerated number of people and animals healed by Jesus.

of that script while Mark and Luke did not use as much of it as he did. Home also stated this in his commentary printed in 1822 AD,¹ but he does not seem to agree with their opinion, which, however, does not make any difference as far as our point of view is concerned.

VIEWS ON THE SUBJECT OF THE CHRONICLES

Almost all the Judaeo-Christian scholars are agreed on the point that both Books of Chronicles were written by the Prophet Ezra with the help of two other Prophets, Haggai and Zechariah. The above three Prophets are jointly supposed to be the author of this book. However, strangely enough, we know for a fact that the First Book of Chronicles contains many errors as has been admitted by the scholars of both the Christians and the Jews. They have said that through the folly of the author the name of the grandson was written instead the name of the son.

They have also said that Ezra, who wrote these books, did not even know which of them were sons and grandsons. The script from which Ezra copied was defective and incomplete and he could not distinguish the false from the true, as will be shown in the next chapter. This evidence is more than sufficient to reach the conclusion that these books were not written through inspiration. Their dependence on defective and incomplete documents is further proof. However the two books of the Chronicles are held to be as sacred as the other books of the Bible both by the Christians and the Jews.

This also confirms our suspicion that, according to the Christian faith, it is not necessary for the Prophets, as we have seen before, to be free from committing sins. Similarly, they are not necessarily free from errors in their writings, with the result that these books cannot be considered to be written through inspiration.

Whatever we have so far discussed in this chapter is enough to show that the Christians are not in a position to make a definite claim

¹. Vol. 4, page. 295.

that any single book of the Old or the New Testaments was written through inspiration.

THE MUSLIM ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE GOSPELS

From all that has preceded it is quite clear that we can claim without the fear of being wrong that the original Pentateuch and the original Evangel have disappeared and become extinct from the world. The books we have today which go by these names are no more than historical accounts containing both true and false accounts of past ages. We strictly deny that the original Torah (Pentateuch) and the original Evangel existed at the time of the Prophet Muhammad (Peace be on him) and that they were not changed until later. As far as the Epistles of Paul are concerned, even if we grant that they were really written by him, they are still not acceptable to us because it is our well-founded opinion that Paul was a traitor and a liar who introduced a completely new concept of Christianity, absolutely different from what Jesus himself preached.¹

As far as the disciples of Jesus who were living after the Ascension of Jesus are concerned, they are held to be respectable and honest by the Muslims. They are not, however, considered to be Prophets (and therefore able to have received inspiration from God). They were ordinary human beings and not free from human errors. Their teachings and their statements have lost validity through the absence of authenticated historical verification: for instance, the

1. This opinion of the Muslim community should not be misunderstood as the product of prejudice and slander. He was considered a traitor even by the family of Jesus and his disciples. We reproduce below the opinion of a modern French scholar, Maurice Bucaille. He says on page 52 of his book *The Bible, The Qur'an and Science*: "Paul is the most controversial figure in Christianity. He was considered to be a traitor to Jesus's thought by the family of Jesus and by the apostles who had stayed in Jerusalem in the circle around James. Paul created Christianity at the expense of those whom Jesus had gathered around him to spread his teachings. He had not known Jesus during his lifetime and he proved the legitimacy of his mission by declaring that Jesus, raised from the dead, had appeared to him on the road to Damascus." (Wali Raazi)

absence of any sign of the existence of the present gospels until the end of the second century AD, the disappearance of the original Hebrew copy of Matthew's gospel and the unavailability even of the name of the translator of the remaining translation, and the presence of accumulated errors and manipulations in the present text. As far as Mark and Luke are concerned, they were not disciples of Jesus, and there is no indication that they ever received inspiration from God.

However we do solemnly believe that the Torah (Pentateuch) was the book revealed to the Prophet Moses: The Holy Qur'an says:¹

We gave Moses the Book (Torah)

And we also find in the Holy Qur'an in reference to Jesus son of Mary:

We gave him the Evangel.²

And the nineteenth chapter of the Holy Qur'an, called 'Maryam' after Mary the mother of Jesus, quotes Jesus as saying:

He hath given me the book (the Evangel).³

The present gospels, chronicles and epistles are certainly not the Evangel referred to by the Holy Qur'an and so they are not, as such, acceptable to the Muslims. The Islamic teaching regarding the Pentateuch, the other books of the Old Testament, and the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament is that any biblical statements which are confirmed by the Qur'anic Revelation will be accepted and respected by the Muslims and any statements rejected by the Qur'an will be rejected by the Muslims. Any statements about which the Holy Qur'an is silent, the Muslims too should remain silent about

1. Qur'an 2:89.

2. Qur'an 5:46.

3. The complete verse is this: "He said, I am indeed the servant of God, he hath given me the Book (the Evangel) and made me a Prophet." (Wali Raazi)

without rejecting or accepting them.

Allah the Almighty addressed His Prophet Muhammad (Peace be on Him) in the Holy Qur'an in these words:

To thee we sent the Book (Qur'an) in truth confirming what came before it of the Book, and assuring its safety.¹

The famous commentary on the Holy Qur'an, *Ma'alim-u-Tanzeel*, contains the following comments on this verse:

According to Ibn al-Jurayj, the last phrase of this verse, 'assuring its safety', signifies that any statement produced by the People of the Book (the followers of Christianity and Judaism) will be accepted, subject to its confirmation by the Holy Qur'an, otherwise that particular statement will be considered as false and unacceptable. Sa'id ibn Musayyab and Zihag said the word "*muhaimin*" in this verse signifies "the one who judges", while Khalil gave its meaning as "protector and guard". These different shades of meanings, however, do not change the general implication that any book or statement confirmed by the Holy Qur'an should be considered as the word of God; the rest are obviously excluded as not being the word of God.

What follows are the remarks on this matter from the commentary *Tafseer-e-Mazhari*:

If the Holy Qur'an bears witness to it, you are bound to confirm it, and if it rejects or says it is false, it must be rejected by us. If the Holy Qur'an has been silent, you too have to be silent because, in that case, the possibility of truth and falsehood will be equal.

Imam al-Bukhari cited a tradition of the Holy Prophet, reported by Ibn 'Abbas, in his *Kitabu'sh-Shahadat* along with its chain of authorities, then the same *hadith* has been cited by him in *Kitabu'l-I'tisam*

1. Qur'an 5:51

supported by a different chain of reporters, and the same *hadith* was again quoted by him in his book *Kitabur Radd 'ala Jahmiyyah*, reported by a different group of narrators.

Why do you go to the People of the Book, the Jews and the Christians, to seek injunctions about the *Shari'a* while your Book, the Holy Qur'an, revealed to Muhammad, the Prophet of Allah, is the latest and freshest revelation of God. You recite it in its original form. Allah Almighty has told you that the Jews, have changed the Pentateuch, the Book of Allah, having written it with their own hands. They started saying that it was from Allah, only to get a small amount of money in return. Does not your knowledge prevent you from asking them questions.

The other version of this *hadith* as cited by al-Bukhari in *Kitab-ur-Radd 'ala Jahmiyyah* is as follows:

O Muslims ! Why do you ask the People of the Book questions regarding anything when your own Book is the Word which God has revealed to your Prophet, Muhammad (Peace be on Him). It is new and fresh, pure and original, free from foreign touch. Allah has declared in His Book that the People of the Book have changed and distorted their Books. They have written them with their own hands and claimed that they come from God, (they did so) only for a small amount of money. Does the knowledge which has come to you not prevent you from seeking guidance from them? No, by God ! We have not seen them asking you about what has been sent to you. Why then do you ask them knowing that their books have been distorted.

Kitabu'l-I'tisam contains the following statement of the companion Mu'awiyah (may Allah be pleased with Him) regarding Ka'b al-Ahbar (an expert on the Bible and a scholar of Islam):

Although he was one of the most truthful of those schol-

ars of hadith who sometimes report traditions from the People of the Book, we have nevertheless found falsehood in them (in the reports of the Bible).

This implies that the falsehood found in those reports was due to the fact that those books had been distorted, not Ka'b al-Ahbar's misstatement, because he is considered one of the righteous scholars of the Bible by the Companions of the Prophet. The phrase, "We have found falsehood in them," clearly denotes that the Companions of the Prophet had the belief that all the Judaeo-Christian books had been distorted.

Every Muslim scholar who has examined the Torah and the Evangel has certainly refused to recognise the authenticity of these books. The author of the book *Takhjeel Man Harrafaal Injeel* said in chapter two of his book regarding the present gospels:

These gospels are not the true and genuine Gospel which was sent through the Prophet (Jesus) and revealed by God.

Later in the same chapter he said:

And the true Evangel is only the one which was spoken by the tongue of Christ.

Again in chapter nine he stated:

Paul through his clever deception deprived all the Christians of their original faith, because he found their understanding so weak that he deluded them quite easily into believing anything he wished. By this means he totally abolished the original Pentateuch.

One of the Indian Scholars has written his judgement about the thesis of the author of *Meezan ul Haq* and the speech made by me in the public debate held in Delhi. This judgement has been added as a supplement to a Persian book called *Rislatu'l-Munazarah* printed in 1270 AH in Delhi. He said that a certain Protestant scholar, either

because of a misunderstanding or perhaps through misinformation, publicly claimed that the Muslims did not refute the present Torah and Evangel. This scholar himself went to the scholars of Delhi to find out whether this was true. He was told by the '*ulama*' (Muslim scholars) that the collection of books called the New Testament was not acceptable as it was not the same Evangel which had been revealed to the Prophet Jesus. He got this judgement of the '*ulama*' in writing and then made it part of his book. All the Indian scholars of Islam have verified this judgement for the guidance of the people.

THE OPINION OF MUSLIM SCHOLARS

THE OPINION OF IMAM AR-RAZI¹

Imam ar-Razi said in his book '*Matlib ul-Aliya*' in the chapter on *Nubuwwah* (the prophethood) in the fourth section:

The effect of the original teaching of Jesus was very limited because he never preached the faith which the Christians ascribe to him. The idea of Father and son and the concept of trinity are the worst kind of atheism and association and are certainly the product of ignorance. Such heretical teachings cannot be ascribed to so great a Prophet as Jesus who was innocent of all such crimes. We are therefore certain that Jesus could have not preached this impure faith. He originally preached monotheism and not tritheism as the Christians claim. But this teaching of Jesus did not spread due to many historical factors. His message therefore remained very limited.

THE OPINION OF IMAM AL-QURTUBI

Imam al-Qurtubi said in his book *Kitabul A'lam Bima Fi Deeni'n-Nasara Mina'l Fisadi Wa'l Awham*:

The present gospels, which are called evangels, are not the same Evangel which the Prophet Muhammad (Peace be on Him) alluded to in the words:

'And Allah revealed the Torah and the Evangel for the guidance of the earlier people.'

Then al-Qurtubi put forward the argument that the disciples of Jesus were not Prophets, hence not protected from impurity, and the

1. Imam ar-Razi, a great authority on almost all the Islamic Sciences and author of many valuable books on Qur'an, hadith, history and other sciences.

miraculous events ascribed to them have not been proved by an unbroken chain of reporters. There are only statements made by isolated reporters. We also do not find any indication that the copies of these gospels are free from serious manipulations. They are wrong. If, for a moment, we accept that these reports are true, they are still not an argument for proving the truth of all the wonders attributed to the disciples, nor do they help in proving the claim of prophethood for them, because they never made any claim to prophethood; on the contrary, they solemnly confirmed that the Prophet Jesus was a preacher.

Al-Qurtubi also said:

It is evident from the above discussion that the present gospels have not been authenticated by means of an unbroken chain of transmission, nor is there any indication that the copiers were protected from wrong action and therefore the possibility of error and fault from them cannot be overlooked. The presence of the above two factors deprives the gospels of their divine character, authenticity and hence their reliability. The proven presence of human manipulation within the text of these gospels is enough to prove their unacceptability. We quote, however, some examples from these books to show the carelessness of their copiers and blunders made by them.

After producing several examples he said:

These examples are sufficient to prove that the present gospels and the Pentateuch cannot be trusted and that neither of them are capable of providing divine guidance to man, because no historical chain of transmission can be adduced in favour of either in support of their authenticity.

We have already cited several examples to show that these books have been subject to great changes and distortions in their texts. The condition of other books of the Christian theologians can well be imagined in the light of the distorted texts of the Judaeo-Christian scriptures, books of such prime importance to them.

This book of al-Qurtubi can be seen in the Topkapi Library in Istanbul.

THE OPINION OF AL-MAQRIZI

Al-Maqrizi was a great scholar of Islam in the eighth century AH. He said in the first volume of his history:

The Jews think that the book which they have is true and original, free from all corruption. The Christians, on the other hand, claim that the Septuagint¹ version of the Bible which is with them is free from any possible distortion and change, while the Jews deny this and contradict their statement. The Samaritans consider their Pentateuch to be the only genuine version as compared to all others. There is nothing with them to eliminate the doubts about this difference of opinion among them.²

The same difference of opinion is found among the Christians regarding the Evangel. For the Christians have four versions of the Evangel which have been combined together in a single book. The first version is of Matthew, the second of Mark, the third of Luke and the fourth of John.

Each of them wrote his gospel according to his own preaching in his own area with the help of his memory. There are innumerable contradictions, incompatibilities and inconsistencies between their various accounts regarding the attributes of Jesus, his message, the time of his Crucifixion and his genealogy. The contradictions are irresolvable.

Alongside this the Marcionites and the Ebionites have their separate version of the Evangel, each being different

1. The Septuagint is the oldest version of the Old Testament. The Septuagint is so-called because in the third century BC seventy (more correctly seventy two) translators were sent to Alexandria where they prepared this translation with their combined effort. Later on, the same translation was acknowledged by Greeks as their Bible.

2. *Britannica* page 868 vol. 14. Marcion.

from the present canonical gospels. The Manichaeans also claim to have an Evangel of their own totally different from the current accepted gospels. They claim that this is the only genuine Evangel present in the world and the rest are inauthentic. They have another evangel called the Evangel of AD 70 (Septuagint) which is ascribed to Ptolamæus. The Christians in general do not recognize this gospel as genuine.

In the presence of the above multifarious differences to be found within the corpus of the Judæo-Christian revelation, it is almost impossible for them to sort out the truth."

The author of *Kashf az-Zunun* said with regard to this matter that the Evangel was a book which was revealed to Jesus, the son of Mary, and, discussing the lack of authenticity and genuineness of the present gospels, he said:

The Evangel which was in reality revealed to Jesus was a single book which was absolutely free from contradictions and inconsistencies. It is the Christians who have put the false blame on Allah and His Prophet (Jesus) by ascribing the present gospel to them.

The author of *Hidayatu'l-Hayara Fi Ajwibatu'l-Yahood wa'n-Nasara* said quite explicitly:

The present Torah (Pentateuch) owned by the Jews is much distorted and defective, a fact known to every biblical reader. The Biblical scholars, themselves, are certain and sure of the fact that the original Torah which was revealed to Moses was genuine and totally free from the present distortions and corruptions. There was no corruption present in the Evangel which was originally revealed to Christ and which could not have included the event of the crucifixion of Christ, or other events like his resurrection three days after his death. These are, in fact, additions inserted by their elders and have nothing whatever to do with divine Truth."

He further said:

Several Islamic scholars have laboriously pointed out hundreds of specific examples and passages showing contradictions, incompatibilities and differences in the so-called Canonical Gospels. It is only to avoid an unnecessary elongated discussion that we refrain from presenting more examples.

The first two parts of this book should be more than enough to prove the truth of this claim.

TWO CLAIMS TO THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE GOSPELS

Sometimes Protestant scholars try to misguide people with regard to the historicity of the Synoptic gospels. They put forward their claim that authentic proofs of the originality of the present gospels existed during the first and the second centuries AD, by reason of the fact that Clement and Ignatius testified to their presence.

The second claim advanced by them is that Mark wrote his gospel with the help of Peter while Luke wrote his gospel with the help of Paul. Since both Peter and Paul were men of inspiration, the above two gospels are also divinely inspired books.

It would seem to be our duty to examine the validity of these two misguiding claims, each one separately, in the light of available historical data and general human logic.

ANSWER TO THE FIRST CLAIM

The main point of dispute regarding the originality of the present gospels is the lack of an uninterrupted continuity in transmission of the reporting authorities of any of the gospels. There is no evidence that any of the gospels have come down to us direct from Jesus through his disciples to the subsequent recipients so as to form a continuous chain of reliable reporters. To say it more simply, there should be a reliable record of a recognised disciple of Jesus bearing witness that whatever he has written was told to him by Jesus in the presence of one or more people of such and such names. Then the next reporter should bear witness to having received, heard or been told the same statement by that particular disciple of Jesus in the presence of such and such people. Then one or more of those present should have conveyed the same text to others by the same procedure so that the texts would have been conveyed to us with an uninterrupted chain of reporters traceable directly back to Jesus himself (as is the case with Qur'anic revelation).

Now we say, and without any fear of being wrong, that the Christians do not possess any such succession of authorities from the authors of the gospels to the end of the second century or the beginning of the third century AD. We, ourselves, have dug into their books to find any trace of such proofs, and also sought guidance from renowned Christian scholars but could not get anywhere. The priest, French,¹ during our public polemic with him, tried to explain this away by saying that we do not have any such authorities due to the historical calamities which befell the Christians during the first three centuries. It is, therefore, not correct to say that the priest Clement and Ignatius had no such authority with them in their time.

We do not necessarily refute the conjectures and suppositions by which they ascribe these writings to their authors. What we are trying to say is that these suppositions and conjectures cannot be accepted as an argument for the genuineness of the word of God. Neither do we deny the fact that the present gospels gained popularity towards the end of the second century or at the beginning of the third century, with all their faults, errors, and contradictions.

We must be allowed to bring to light some facts regarding Clement and Ignatius to eliminate any misapprehensions.

THE SOURCE OF CLEMENT'S LETTER

Clement, the Patriarch of Rome, is said to have written a letter to the church of Corinth. There is a disagreement between the scholars regarding the exact year that this letter was written. Canterbury puts it between 64 and 70 AD. Leclerc claimed it to have been written in 69 AD, while Duchesne and Tillemont have said that Clement did not become Pope until 91 or 93 A.D. How Clement could have written letters to the church in 64 or 70 AD when he was not yet Pope is not explained. However, setting aside all the differences, the letter in

1. Our author had a famous public polemic with a priest named Fonder in India. French was appointed as an assistant to Fonder. The assistant of the author was Dr. Vazir Khan. (Taqi)

question could have not been written later than 96 AD. Some sentences of this letter, however, happen to be identical to some of the sentences in one of the four gospels. This allowed the Christians to claim that Clement had copied those sentences from the gospel. This claim is liable to be rejected for the following reasons :

Firstly, it is not sufficient to copy only some sentences from a gospel. If this were the case the claim of those people would be true who are considered heretics¹ by the Protestants because they have claimed that all the moral teachings contained in the gospels have been borrowed from the pagans and other philosophers (because some of their ideas were identical to some of the ideas of the gospels).

The author of *Aksihumo* said:

The moral teachings of the Evangel, of which the Christians are very proud, have been copied word for word from the Book of Ethics of Confucius,² who lived in the sixth century BC. For example he said under his moral no. 24: "Behave towards others as you want to be behaved towards by others. You need only this moral because this is the root of all other morals. Do not wish for the death of your enemy because to do so would be absurd since his life is controlled by God." Moral no. 53 goes: "It is quite possible for us to overlook our enemy without revenging him. Our natural thoughts are not always bad."

Similar good advice can be found in the books of Indian and Greek philosophers.

Secondly, if Clement really had copied it from the gospel, all its contents would have been identical to the gospel, but such is not the case. On the contrary, he differed from the gospel in many places, showing that he had not copied what he wrote from the gospels. Even if it were proved that he had copied from a gospel, it might have been

1. The Rationalists who strongly favour liberalism.

2. Confucius, the great moral philosopher of China born in 551 BC, who had strong influence on the religion and general character of the Chinese. The past Chinese ideology was thus called Confucianism.

from any of the many gospels which were current in his time, as Eichhorn admitted in respect of the sentence spoken by a heavenly voice at the time of the descension of the Holy Spirit.

Thirdly, Clement was one of the followers of the disciples and his knowledge about Christ was no way less than that of Mark and Luke, which allows us to believe, and logically so, that he might have written the letter from reports received by himself directly. If there were an indication anywhere in his writing that he had copied it from any of the gospels, our claim would certainly have been out of place.

We quote below three passages from his letter.

He who loves Jesus should follow his commandment.

Jones claimed that Clement copied this sentence from John 14:15 which reads:

If ye love me, keep my commandments.

The apparent similarity between these two statements led Mr. Jones to suppose that Clement had copied it from John. However, he has chosen to overlook the clear textual difference between these two statements. The falsity of this claim has already been proved by our showing that the letter could not have been written after 96 AD, while, according to their own findings, the Gospel of John was written in 98 AD. It is nothing but a desperate effort to provide some authenticity to the present gospels.

Horne said on page 307, Vol. 4 of his commentaries printed 1824:.

According to Chrysostom and Epiphanius, the early scholars and according to Dr. Mill, Fabricius, Leclerc and Bishop Tomline, John wrote his gospel in 97 AD, while Mr. Jones situates this gospel in 98 AD.

However, a true lover always follows what his love commands, otherwise he would not be a lover in the true sense of the word. Lardner justly said in his *Commentaries* printed 1827 on Page 40

of Vol. 2:

I understand that the copying of this letter from the gospel is doubtful, because Clement was fully aware of the fact that any claim to the love of Christ necessitated practical obedience to his commandments, because Clement had been in the company of the disciples of Jesus.

THE SECOND PASSAGE OF CLEMENT'S LETTER

It appears in chapter thirteen of this letter:

We follow what is written, because the Holy Spirit has said that a wise man is never proud of his wisdom. And we should keep in mind the words of Christ who said at the time of preaching patience and practice :

“Be ye merciful, that ye be shown mercy, forgive that ye be forgiven; ye will be acted upon, the same as you will act upon others, as you will give so shall you be given, you will be judged as you will judge upon others; as you will pity, so shall you be pitied upon and with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again.”

The Christians claim that this passage was taken by Clement from Luke 6:36-38 and Matt.7:1,2,12. The passage from the Luke is this:

Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful. Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven: Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you mete.

The passage from Matthew 7:1,2 reads:

Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.

And in verse 12:

Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.

THE THIRD PASSAGE OF CLEMENT

Chapter forty-six of his letter contains this passage:

Remember the words of Lord Christ who said, 'Woe unto the man who has committed a sin. It would have been better for him if he had not been born, that he should harm those chosen by me. And whosoever shall offend my little ones, it will be better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

The Christians have claimed that the above passage was copied from Matthew 26:24 and 18:6 and Mark 9:42 and Luke 17:2 : We reproduce these verses below:

The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born.

Matthew 18:6 contains the following lines:

But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

Mark 9:42 reads:

And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. }

The text of Luke 17:2 is this:

It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones.

Having reproduced the passages from Clement and the above texts of the gospels, Lardner said in his *Commentaries* printed 1827 vol. 2 page 37 that:

The above two passages of Clement are his longest passages and this is why Paley confined himself to them to support the claim of authenticity for the gospels. This claim does not, however, stand to reason because Clement would at least have made a reference to the gospels had he copied any passage from them and he would also have copied the rest of the related text or, if that was not possible, the text reproduced by him should have been totally consistent and similar to the text of the gospel. However none of these conditions are met. Such being the case, there is no possibility of its have been copied from the gospel.

It is surprising to see Luke being referred to as the teacher of Clement, imparting to him the knowledge which he must already have had, being the companion of the disciples just as Luke was.

In volume 2 of his commentaries, Lardner remarked about the above two passages:

When we study the writings of those who enjoyed the company of the apostles or of the other followers of our Lord who, like the evangelists, were fully conversant with the teachings of Christ, we find ourselves very much in doubt without the evidence of a clear reference. We are faced with

the difficulty of ascertaining whether Clement copied written statements of Christ or whether he is simply reminding the Corinthians of the sayings which he and the Corinthians had heard from the Apostles and their followers. Leclerc preferred the former opinion, while the Bishop of Paris preferred the latter.

If we accept that the three Gospels had been compiled prior to that time, in that case Clement could possibly have copied from them, though the word and expression may not exactly be identical. But that he actually has copied is not easy to confirm, because this man was fully acquainted with these matters even prior to the compilation of the Gospels. It is also possible that Clement would have described events already known to him without referring to the Gospels even after their compilation out of his old habit. In both the cases, the faith in the truth of the Gospels is reaffirmed, obviously so in first case, and in the second case because his words correspond to the text of the Gospels, proving that the Gospels were so widely known that the Corinthians and Clement both had the knowledge of them.

Through this we achieve the belief that the evangelists faithfully conveyed the words consisting of the true teachings of Christ. These words deserve the most careful preservation, though there we have a difficulty. I think that the most scholars will agree with the opinion of Leclerc, however, as Paul advises us in Acts 20:35 with the words:

‘And to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.’

It is, I am sure, generally acknowledged that Paul did not copy the above statement from any letter but just quoted the words of the Christ which were in his knowledge and in the knowledge of others. This does not mean that it may be accepted as a general rule but this method can possibly be applied in letters. We know that Polycarp also used this method in his writings. We are quite sure that he also copied from the written gospels.

It is clear from the above statement that the Christians are not certain that Clement really copied from the canonical gospels, and any claim to this effect is only based on conjecture.

We do not agree with the conclusion of Lardner that in both cases the truth of the present gospels is proved because there can be no certainty in the presence of doubt. As the evangelists incompletely recorded the words of Christ in this particular instance, they might have done the same in other places too, and they might have not recorded the exact words used.

Moreover, if we overlook this point for a moment, it only proves that these particular sentences are the words of Christ, it does not in any way help us to believe that all the contents of the gospels are the genuine words of Christ. The knowledge of a certain statement cannot be an argument for the acceptance of other statements. If that were the case, all the rejected gospels would have to be accepted as genuine simply because some sentences of Clement bear some similarity with them.

We are also confident in our refutation of the claim that Polycarp also used the method of copying from the gospels in spite of his own knowledge, gained by being, like Clement, also a companion of the disciples of Jesus. Both of them are of equal status. His copying from the gospels cannot prove their genuineness. It is, on the other hand, possible that like Paul he might have ascribed some statements to Christ.¹

THE LETTERS OF IGNATIUS

Let us now find out the truth regarding the letters written by Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch. Lardner said in vol. 2 of his commentary:

1. That is, he might have ascribed some statements to Christ as Paul did with the statements of Acts 20:35 which are not present in the gospels.

the difficulty of ascertaining whether Clement copied written statements of Christ or whether he is simply reminding the Corinthians of the sayings which he and the Corinthians had heard from the Apostles and their followers. Leclerc preferred the former opinion, while the Bishop of Paris preferred the latter.

If we accept that the three Gospels had been compiled prior to that time, in that case Clement could possibly have copied from them, though the word and expression may not exactly be identical. But that he actually has copied is not easy to confirm, because this man was fully acquainted with these matters even prior to the compilation of the Gospels. It is also possible that Clement would have described events already known to him without referring to the Gospels even after their compilation out of his old habit. In both the cases, the faith in the truth of the Gospels is reaffirmed, obviously so in first case, and in the second case because his words correspond to the text of the Gospels, proving that the Gospels were so widely known that the Corinthians and Clement both had the knowledge of them.

Through this we achieve the belief that the evangelists faithfully conveyed the words consisting of the true teachings of Christ. These words deserve the most careful preservation, though there we have a difficulty. I think that the most scholars will agree with the opinion of Leclerc, however, as Paul advises us in Acts 20:35 with the words:

‘And to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.’

It is, I am sure, generally acknowledged that Paul did not copy the above statement from any letter but just quoted the words of the Christ which were in his knowledge and in the knowledge of others. This does not mean that it may be accepted as a general rule but this method can possibly be applied in letters. We know that Polycarp also used this method in his writings. We are quite sure that he also copied from the written gospels.

It is clear from the above statement that the Christians are not certain that Clement really copied from the canonical gospels, and any claim to this effect is only based on conjecture.

We do not agree with the conclusion of Lardner that in both cases the truth of the present gospels is proved because there can be no certainty in the presence of doubt. As the evangelists incompletely recorded the words of Christ in this particular instance, they might have done the same in other places too, and they might have not recorded the exact words used.

Moreover, if we overlook this point for a moment, it only proves that these particular sentences are the words of Christ, it does not in any way help us to believe that all the contents of the gospels are the genuine words of Christ. The knowledge of a certain statement cannot be an argument for the acceptance of other statements. If that were the case, all the rejected gospels would have to be accepted as genuine simply because some sentences of Clement bear some similarity with them.

We are also confident in our refutation of the claim that Polycarp also used the method of copying from the gospels in spite of his own knowledge, gained by being, like Clement, also a companion of the disciples of Jesus. Both of them are of equal status. His copying from the gospels cannot prove their genuineness. It is, on the other hand, possible that like Paul he might have ascribed some statements to Christ.¹

THE LETTERS OF IGNATIUS

Let us now find out the truth regarding the letters written by Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch. Lardner said in vol. 2 of his commentary:

1. That is, he might have ascribed some statements to Christ as Paul did with the statements of Acts 20:35 which are not present in the gospels.

Eusebius and Jerome both mentioned certain of his letters. Apart from these some other letters are also attributed to him, which are generally considered by most of the scholars to be false and concocted. My opinion is no different. There are two copies of his seven letters, the large and small. Except for Mr. Weston and a few of his followers, all the scholars have decided that additions have been made in the larger one, the smaller version, however, can possibly be ascribed to him.

I have carefully made a comparative study of both the texts and my study revealed that the smaller version was turned into a larger one by the inclusion of many additions and insertions. It is not the case that the larger was turned into the smaller through the exclusion of some of the contents. The ancient writings, also, are more in accordance with the smaller version.

The question whether Ignatius really did write these letters remains to be settled. There is great dispute and disagreement on this point. The great scholars have made free use of their pens in expressing their opinions. The study of the writing of both the camps has made the question all the more complicated. However, in my opinion, this much is settled and decided; that these are the same letters which were present in the time of Origen and were read by Eusebius. Some of the sentences are not appropriate to the time of Ignatius. It is therefore better if we accept that these sentences are later additions instead of rejecting all the letters on the ground of these sentences, especially keeping in view the crisis of shortage of copies which we are facing.

It is also possible that some of the followers of Arius¹ might have made additions to the smaller version just as they did to the larger. Additions may also have been made by others.

1. Arius was a great philosopher and theologian who had monotheistic views as against trinitarianism. He had many followers. His views were rejected by the Council of Nicaea.

Paley writes in his footnotes:

In the past, the translation of three letters of Ignatius were present in the Syrian language and were printed by William Cureton. It is almost certain that the smaller letters, which were revised by Ussher, contained many additions."

The above writings of the Christian scholars bring out the following facts :

1. All the letters except these seven letters are definitely fabricated and forged according to the Christian scholars and are therefore unacceptable.
2. The larger version of the letters is similarly not genuine in the opinion of all the scholars except Mr. Weston and a few of his followers.
3. As far as the smaller collection is concerned, there is great dispute and difference of opinion among great scholars with regards to its authenticity. Both the groups of scholars have their own arguments against or in favour of its authenticity. The group of scholars who have favoured it also admit its having been subjected to later modifications either by Arius or by others, with the result that this collection also appears to be equally of doubtful authenticity.

It seems most probable that this collection of letters was also put together in the third century AD similarly to the other letters. This should not present too much of a surprise, in view of the general practice of the theologians of early centuries who frequently prepared false writings and attributed to other writers to suit their whims. Historical records bear witness to the fact that there were not less than seventy-five gospels which were falsely attributed to Christ, to Mary and to the disciples of Christ. It does, therefore, not seem particularly far-fetched to assert that these seven letters, too, were prepared and

attributed to Ignatius, similar to other such letters and similar to the gospel of Tatian¹ which was falsely attributed to him. Adam Clarke said in the introduction of his commentary:

The book which was genuinely ascribed to Tatian has disappeared and the one which is now attributed to him is doubtful in the eyes of most of the scholars, and they are right in their suspicion.

Let us ignore all the above points for a moment and take it that the letters in question really were originally written by Ignatius. Even this does not help much because, after the additions and modifications inserted by later people, they have lost their originality and are no longer acceptable.

According to the scholars some sentences of these letters were certainly added later on and so there is nothing to remove suspicion from other sentences which are supposed by them to be original. They, likewise, might have been added to or modified in subsequent times.

Eusebius said in chapter 23 of the fourth volume of his history:

Dionysius, the Bishop of Corinth, admitted that he had written several letters on the request of some of his friends, but those deputies of Satan filled them with profanities and altered some parts and added others. This made me all the more aggrieved. Therefore, there is no wonder if someone made intentional additions in the holy books of our Lord, because they had no qualms in respect of the books of other authorities.

Adam Clarke has said in his introduction to his commentary:

The great works of Origen have been lost and several of his Commentaries which are available contain an abundance

1. This is also called *Diatessaron* of Tatian. According to G.T. Menley this was put together by combining the present four gospels, but it is not known if it was in the Greek or in the Syrian language.

of unfactual and imaginary comments which in itself is a powerful argument in favour of the fact that they have been interpolated."

Michael Musaka, a Protestant scholar, has said in his Arabic work, *Ajwibatu'l-Engeleer Ala Abateel-At-Taqledeen*, section one, chapter 10:

As far as their habit of distorting the statements of the ancients, we should first produce our arguments so that our position may not be similar to those of our opponents, that is to say, so that our claims may not be considered as baseless as theirs. We proceed to say that the book *Afshin* which is attributed to John Chrysostom, the Golden Mouth,¹ and which is recited in the churches during the services of consecration, presents different texts. That is, the text recited by one group is different from the text recited by others. For, in the copy of the Orthodox, the Father God is besought to make descend his Holy Spirit on the bread and wine and turn them into flesh and blood, while in the text of the Catholics it is said that He should send the Holy Ghost on the bread and wine so that they may be transformed. But in the time of Maximus, it was changed by the people and they started to say that both the transformable things have² fled away for the reason that the Orthodox had claimed against it. But the Catholics of Syria say it with these words, 'Send thy Holy Spirit upon this bread that is the secret of the body of Christ.' There is no word denoting transformation present in this text. It is possible that this statement might have been of Chrysostom (the Golden Mouth) as the preaching of transformation was not introduced in his time. And Major Bobi Tompter, who had converted to Catholicism said in his speech to the Orthodox in 1722: "I have compared these books with the Orthodox version pos-

1. Chrysostom, being a great orator, was called the Golden Mouth. He was born in 347 AD and was later made bishop of Constantinople.

2. We have faithfully tried to remove the ambiguity which is to be found in the Arabic Text, but still we are at a loss to understand what the author has to convey.

sessed by the Basilians,¹ and we did not find a single word in these books denoting transformation. This story of transformation of the bread and wine was invented by Nicephorus, the patriarch of Constantinople, and is ridiculous. Now, when they could have made a play of such a pious text as *Afshin* and altered its contents to suit their unholy intentions and when they did not hesitate to attribute their distortions to such a pious man, how can they be trusted and how can they be free from the suspicion of changing and distorting the texts of their ancestors.

We have had our own experience in recent years that Deacon Ghariel of Egypt, who was a Catholic, took great pains and spent a lot of money in correcting the translation of the commentary of Chrysostom from the original Greek copy. The Orthodox scholars, who were expert in the Greek and Arabic languages, compared it in Damascus and testified to its accuracy, and then a certified version was prepared. But Maximus did not allow its publication in Tyre.²

This copy was given to Bishop Alexis of Spain who made a thorough examination of the book. Both of them were totally ignorant of the original Greek version. In order to make it correspond with the teachings of the Pope they made many changes through additions and omissions using their own discretion. Having so spoilt the whole book they attested to it with their stamps and then it was allowed to be published. It was not until the publication of its first volume, when it was compared with the original manuscript which was in safe custody with the Orthodox, that their unholy act of manipulation was uncovered, with the result that they became the subject of common reproach. Ghariel was so appalled at this incident that he never recovered and died of shock.

Musaka further said:

1. This was a Christian sect who were the followers of Basilius who was the bishop of Caesarea from 329 - 379 AD.

2. A city of Lebanon. There was a temple of the Christians near it.

We produce the unanimous witness of their elders from one of the Arabic books generally available there. This is a report which was unanimously passed in a meeting, along with all its various parts, by the priests of the Maronites, their patriarchs and scholars, with the permission of Monsignor Samani. This report bears the seal of the Church of Rome. It was printed in Tyre with the permission of the chiefs of the Catholics. Discussing the ritual of the offerings this report said that the old liturgies were still present in the churches, free from errors and faults, but they have been attributed to some saints and the pious men who were not the authors of these books, nor could they possibly have written them. Some of them were included by the copiers only to suit their unholy needs. It is more than enough for you to admit that your churches are full of fabricated and forged writings.

He further said:

We are fully aware that our enlightened generation would not dare to make alterations in the holy books, as they are fully wise to the fact that they are watched by the eyes of the protectors of the gospels. However we are not sure of the circumstances which prevailed from the fifth century to the seventh century AD, known as the dark ages, when the Popes and the priests enjoyed a barbarous kingdom of their own. Some of them did not even know how to write and read and the helpless Christians of the East were living a very distressed life, always anxious to save their souls. What happened in that period is best known to them alone. Whenever we come to know the history of that terrible age, and think of the conditions ruling over the Christian church, which had become a symbol of corruption, our grief and sorrow knows no limits.

Keeping in view the facts reproduced above, we leave the judgment to our readers to see the truth of our claim themselves.

THE CANONS OF NICAEEA

The number of the canons passed by the council of Nicaea¹ was twenty. Subsequently many additions were made to them. The Catholics derive their arguments for the Popes authority from Canons No. 37 and 44. It is written on Page 68 and 69 of 'Les Treize Épitres' of the second letter printed in 1849 AD:

The aforementioned council prescribed only twenty canons according to the witness of the history of Theodorus and the writings of Gelasius. The Fourth Ecumenical² council also affirmed that there were only twenty Canons prescribed by the Council of Nice.

Similarly many other false books were written which were attributed to several Popes like Calixtus, Siricius, Nectarius, Alexander and Marcellus. The above book contains this statement on page 80:

Pope Leo and the majority of the Roman scholars have admitted that the books of these Popes are false and fictitious.

1. This council was held in the city of Nice. In 325 AD, a Christian philosopher and theologian Arius started preaching that Christ was not equal to God in his essence. He had monotheistic beliefs. The Emperor Constantine convened a meeting of the great scholars of the Christian world. This council unanimously disacknowledged and rejected the ideas preached by Arius. This meeting is of great significance in Christian history.

2. An ecumenical council, in Christian terminology, is a council inviting scholars from all parts of the world. Here the author is referring to the council which was held in Chalcedon in 451 AD. This Council declared the Monophysites to be heretics. (Al Munajjid).

ANSWER TO THE SECOND CLAIM OF THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE GOSPEL

The second false claim made by the Christian scholars in order to support the authenticity of the gospels is their contention that the gospel of Mark was written with the help of Peter. This is another clever contrivance to misguide the general populace. Let us first have the witness of Irenaeus. He said:

Mark, the follower and the translator of Peter, wrote the teachings of Peter after the death of Paul and Peter.

Lardner said in his commentary:

In my opinion Mark did not write his gospel before 63 or 64 AD. This period is also in accordance with the description of the ancient writer Irenaeus, who said that Mark wrote his gospel after the death of Peter and Paul. Basnage agreed with Irenaeus and said that Mark wrote his gospel in 66 AD after the death of Peter and Paul.

The witnesses of Basnage and Irenaeus are sufficient to prove that this gospel was written after the death of Peter and Paul, and that Peter certainly did not see the gospel of Mark,¹ and the statement, often cited to prove that Peter saw it, is weak and unacceptable. It is why the author of *Murshid ut-Talibeen*, in spite of all his religious preoccupations said on page 170 of his book printed in 1840:

He has falsely answered that the gospel of Mark was written under the guidance of Peter.

This claim of its being written in the life of Peter has therefore, no grounds and hence is rejected.

1. G. T. Menley said that in the Markine Preface of the gospel of Mark, which was written in 170, we are informed that Mark wrote his gospel in Italy after the death of Peter, and this seems to be correct. (*Our Holy Books*)

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE WAS NOT SEEN BY PAUL

Similarly the gospel of Luke was not seen by Paul. This is true for two reasons:

1. Firstly because the findings of the modern Protestant scholars are that Luke wrote his gospel in 63 AD in Achaia. It is established that Paul was released from prison in 63 AD. After that nothing is known about him up to his death but it is most probable that he went to Spain in the West and not towards the Churches of the East, and Achaia is one of the Eastern cities. Most possibly Luke had sent his gospel to Theophilus who was indeed the real cause of writing it.

The author of *Murshid-u-Talibeen* wrote on page 161 of volume two, printed in 1840, discussing the history of Luke:

As Luke¹ did not write anything related to Paul after his release from prison, we know nothing about his travels from his release to his death.

Gardner said in his Commentaries printed 1728 vol. 5, p. 350:

Now we want to write about the life of the disciple, from his release to his death, but we are not helped by Luke in this regard. However we do find some traces in other books of the modern time. The ancient writers do not help. We find great dispute over the question of where Paul went after his release.

In the light of the above, the contention of some of modern scholars that he went to the Churches of the East after his release is not proved. He said in his epistle to the Romans 15:23,24:

But now having no more place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you; Whosoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you; for I trust to see you in my journey...

1. That is, in the Book of Acts, which is considered to be written by Luke.

It is quite explicit from the above statement of their apostle that he had an intention to go to Spain, and at the same time we know that he never went to Spain before his imprisonment. It is therefore, quite logical that he might have gone to Spain after his release, because we do not see any reason for him to have abandoned his intention to travel to Spain. It appears in the Book of Acts 20:25:

And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more.

This statement also indicates that he had no intention to visit the Churches of the East. Clement, the Bishop of Rome, said in his letter:

Paul, in order to unveil the truth to the world, went to the end of the West and then reached the sacred place (i.e. died)."

This too obviously implies that he went towards the West and not to the East before his death.

Lardner first reproduced the statement of Irenaeus as follows:

Luke, the servant of Paul, wrote in a book the tidings that Paul had preached in his sermon.

He further said:

The context of the description indicates that this (Luke's writing the gospel) happened after Mark had written his gospel, that is, after the death of Peter and Paul.

On the grounds of this statement it is physically impossible for Paul to have seen the gospel of Luke. Besides, even if we assume that Paul saw this gospel, it does not prove anything because we do not consider him to have been inspired by God and a statement made by an uninspired person could not achieve the status of inspiration simply by the fact of Paul having seen it.

HUMAN DISTORTION OF THE BIBLE: ALTERATIONS, ADDITIONS AND OMISSIONS

There are two kinds of biblical distortions: explicit distortions which are directly related to clear changes in the text, which arise through alteration, omission or addition to the original text; and implicit distortions which are brought about by deliberate misinterpretation without any actual textual change. There is no dispute over the existence of such distortions in the Bible since all Christians, both Protestants and Catholics, admit their existence.

According to them the verses of the Old Testament containing references to Christ and the injunctions which were, to the Jews, of perpetual value were distorted by the Jews through misinterpretation. Protestant theologians claim that the Catholics have distorted many texts of both the Old and the New Testament. The Catholics similarly accuse the Protestants of having distorted the text of the Bible. We therefore do not need to include demonstrations of implicit distortions as they have already been provided by the Christians themselves.

As far as textual distortion is concerned, this kind of distortion is denied by the Protestants and they offer false arguments and misleading statements in their writings in order to create doubts among the Muslims. It is therefore necessary to demonstrate that all the three kinds of textual distortion, that is, alterations in the text; the deletion of phrases and verses from the text; and later additions to the original texts are abundantly present in both the Old and the New Testaments.

ALTERATIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE BIBLE

It should be noted in the beginning that there are three acknowledged versions of the Old Testament:

1. The Hebrew version which is acknowledged equally by the Jews and the Protestants.

2. The Greek version which was recognized as authentic by the Christians up until the seventh century. Until that time the Hebrew version was considered by the Christians to be inauthentic and distorted. The Greek version is still held to be authentic by the Greek and Eastern Churches. The above two versions include all the books of the Old Testament.

3. The Samaritan version which is recognized by the Samaritans. This is in fact the Hebrew version with the difference that it consists of only seven books that is, the five books of the Pentateuch which are ascribed to Moses, the Book of Joshua and the Book of Judges. This is because the Samaritans do not believe in, or acknowledge, any of the other books of the Old Testament. Another difference is that it includes many additional phrases and sentences that are not present in the Hebrew version. Many Protestant scholars and theologians like Kennicott, Hales and Houbigant recognize it as authentic and do not accept the Hebrew version which they believe to have been distorted by the Jews. In fact the majority of Protestant scholars prefer it to the Hebrew version, as you will see from the following pages.

Here are examples of some of the alterations.

Alteration No.1: The Period from Adam to the Flood

The period from Adam to the flood of Noah, as described by the Hebrew version, is one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years, while according to the Greek version, it is two thousand three hundred and sixty-two years¹ and the Samaritan version gives it as one thousand three hundred and seven years. A table is given in the commentary of Henry and Scott where the age of every descendant has been given at the time when he gave birth to his son except Noah, whose age is given as at the time of the flood.

This table is as follows:

1. This number is given as 2362 in all the versions, but according to this table it comes to 2363. The mistake may be either in the book that the author has used or somewhere in the table.

NAME	HEBREW VERSION	SAMARITAN VERSION	GREEK VERSION
The Prophet Adam	130	130	230
Seth	105	105	205
Cainan	70	70	170
Mabalabel	65	65	165
Jared	162	62	162
Enoch	65	65	165
Methuselah	187	67	187
Lamech	182	53	188
Noah	600	600	600
Total	1650	1307	2262 ¹

The above table shows extremely serious differences between the statements of all three versions. All three versions agree that the age of the Prophet Noah at the time of the Flood was six hundred and the total age of Adam was nine hundred and thirty. However according to the Samaritan version the Prophet Noah was two hundred and thirteen years of age when Adam died which is obviously wrong and goes against the unanimous agreement of the historians and is also erroneous according to the Hebrew and Greek versions. For according to the former, Noah was born one hundred and twenty-six years after the death of Adam and, according to the latter, he was born seven hundred and thirty-two years after the death of Adam. In view of this serious discrepancy, the renowned historian of the Jews, Josephus, who is

1. It should be 2362 according to the above table, but our author has given 2262 in all versions. We have translated it as it is without correction.

also recognized by the Christians, did not accept the statement of any of the three versions and decided that the correct period was two thousand two hundred and fifty-six years.

Alteration No. 2: The period from the Flood to Abraham

The period from the Flood of Noah to the birth of the Prophet Abraham is given as two hundred and ninety-two years in the Hebrew version, one thousand and seventy-two years in the Greek, and nine hundred and forty-two years in the Samaritan version. There is another table covering this period in the Henry and Scott commentary where against every descendant of Noah, the year of the birth of their sons is given except in the case of Shem, against whose name the year of birth is given for his child who was born after the Flood. This table is as follows:

NAME	HEBREW	SAMARITAN	GREEK
Shem	2	2	2
Arphaxad	35	135	135
Cainan	—	—	130
Salah	30	130	130
Eber	34	134	134
Peleg	30	130	130
Rew	32	132	132
Sherug	30	130	130
Nohor	29	79	79
Terah ¹	70	70	70
Total	290	942	1072

1. Terah was the name of Abraham's father, and Azar was his appellation. Some historians think that Azar was Abraham's uncle and the Qur'an has used the word father for uncle.

This discrepancy among the three versions is so serious that it can not be explained. Since the Hebrew version informs us that Abraham was born two hundred and ninety-two years after the Flood and that Noah lived for three hundred and fifty years after the Flood as is understood from Genesis:

And Noah lived after the flood three hundred and fifty years.¹

This means that Abraham was fifty-eight years old at the death of Noah which is wrong according to the Greek and Samaritan versions and according to the unanimous decision of the historians. The Greek version places the birth of Abraham seven hundred and twenty-two years after the death of Noah while the Samaritan makes it five hundred and ninety-two years after his death. Secondly, in the Greek version an additional generation is given that is not to be found in the other two versions. The Evangelist Luke trusted the Greek version and therefore included in the genealogy of Christ the name of Canaan.

This great discrepancy in the statements of the above three versions has caused great difference of opinion among Christians. The historians rejected all three versions and decided that actual period in this case was three hundred and fifty-two years. Josephus, the renowned Jewish historian, also rejected the above three versions and said that the correct figure was nine hundred and ninety-three years, as is evident from the Henry and Scott commentary. The great theologian of the fourth century, Augustine, and other ancient writers favoured the statement of the Greek version. Horsley, the commentator, expressed the same opinion in his comments on Genesis, while Hales thinks that the Samaritan version was correct. The scholar Horne also seems to support the Samaritan version. Henry and Scott's commentary includes this statement:

Augustine held the opinion that the Jews had distorted the description in the Hebrew version with regard to the elders

1. Gen. 9:28.

who lived either prior to the Flood or after it up to the time of Moses, so that the Greek version would be discredited, and because of the enmity which they had against Christianity. It seems that the ancient Christians also favoured this opinion. They thought that this alteration was made by them in 130.

Horne says in the first volume of his commentary:

The scholar Hales presented strong arguments in favour of the Samaritan version. It is not possible to give a summary of his arguments here. The curious reader may see his book from page 80 onward.

Kennicott said:

If we keep in mind the general behaviour of the Samaritans towards the Torah, and also the reticence of Christ at the time of his discourse with the Samaritan woman, and many other points, we are led to believe that the Jews made deliberate alterations in the Torah, and that the claim of the scholars of the Old and the New Testament, that the Samaritans made deliberate changes, is baseless.

Christ's discourse with a Samaritan woman referred to in the above passage is found in the Gospel of John where we find:

The woman saith unto him, Sir, I perceive that Thou art a prophet. Our father worshipped in this mountain; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.¹

The Samaritan woman, convinced that Christ was a Prophet, asked about the most disputed matter between the Jews and the Samaritans in respect of which each of them accused the other of making alterations to the original text. Had the Samaritans distorted it, Christ, being a Prophet, must have disclosed the truth. Instead, he kept silent on the matter, implying that the Samaritans were right and showing that there must be human manipulations in the text of the Holy

1. John 4:19,20.

Scriptures.

Alteration No. 3: Mount Gerizim or Mount Ebal

We find the following statement in Deuteronomy:

It shall be when ye be gone over Jordan that ye shall set up these stones, which I command you this day, in mount Ebal, and thou shall plaster them with plaster..¹

On the other hand the Samaritan version contains:

...the stones which I command set them up in Gerizim.

Ebal and Gerizim are two mountains adjacent to each other as is known from verses 12 and 13 of the same chapter and from 11:29 of the same book. According to the Hebrew version it is clear that the Prophet Moses had commanded them to build a temple on Mount Ebal, while from the Samaritan version we know that he commanded this temple to be built on Gerizim. This was a matter of great dispute between the Jews and the Samaritans, and each of them accused the other of altering the original text of the Pentateuch. The same dispute is found among Protestant scholars on this point. Adam Clarke, the famous Protestant scholar, says on page 817 of the first volume of his commentary:

The scholar Kennicott maintained that the Samaritan version was correct, while the scholars Parry and Verschuur claimed that the Hebrew version was authentic, but it is generally known that Kennicott's arguments are irrefutable, and people positively believe that the Jews, out of their enmity against the Samaritans, changed the text. It is unanimously acknowledged that Mount Gerizim is full of vegetation, springs and gardens while Mount Ebal is barren without any water and vegetation in it. In this case Mount Gerizim fits the

1. Deut. 27:4.

description of 'the place of blessing'¹ and Ebal as the place of curse.

The above makes us understand that Kennicott and other scholars have favoured the Samaritan version and that Kennicott forwarded irrefutable arguments.

Alteration No. 4: Seven Years or Three Years

We find the phrase 'seven years' in II Sam. 24:13, while I Chronicles 21:12 has 'three years'. This has been already discussed earlier.

Obviously one of the two statements must be wrong. Adam Clarke commenting on the statement of Samuel said:

Chronicles contains 'three years' and not 'seven years'. The Greek version similarly has 'three years' and this is undoubtedly the correct statement.

Alteration No. 5: Sister or Wife

I Chronicles of the Hebrew version contains:

And whose sister's name was Micah.²

It should be 'wife' and not 'sister'. Adam Clarke said:

The Hebrew version contains the word 'sister' while the Syrian, Latin and Greek versions have the word 'wife'. The translators have followed these versions.

Protestant scholars have rejected the Hebrew version and followed the above translations indicating that they too consider the Hebrew version to be erroneous.

1. "That thou shall put the blessing upon mount Gerizim, and the curse upon mount Ebal." (Deut. 11:29). Obviously a place of worship should be built on a place of blessing, not on a place of curse.

1. I Chron. 19:30.

Alteration No. 6

II Chronicles 22:2 of the Hebrew version informs us:

Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign.

This statement is undoubtedly wrong because his father Jehoram was forty years¹ old when he died, and Ahaziah was enthroned immediately after the death of his father. If the above statement be true, he must have been two years older than his father. II Kings reads as follows:

Two and twenty years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem.²

Adam Clarke making comments on the statement of Chronicles said in the second volume of his commentaries:

The Syrian and the Arabic translations contain twenty-two years, and some Greek translations have twenty years. Most probably the Hebrew version was the same, but the people used to write the numbers in the form of letters. It is most likely that the writer has substituted the letter 'mim' (m=40) for the letter 'kaf' (k=20).

He further said:

The statement of II Kings is correct. There is no way of comparing the one with the other. Obviously any statement allowing a son to be older than his father cannot be true. Home and Henry and Scott have also admitted it to the mistake of the writers.

1. "Thirty and two years old was he when he began to reign, and he reigned in Jerusalem." II Chr. 21:20.

2. II Kings 8:26.

Alteration No. 7

II Chronicles 28:19 of the Hebrew version contains:

The lord brought Judah low because of Ahaz king of Israel.

The word Israel in this statement is certainly wrong because Ahaz was the king of Judah and not of Israel. The Greek and the Latin versions have the word 'Judah'. The Hebrew version therefore has been changed.

Alteration No. 8

Psalms 40 contains this:

Mine ears hast thou opened.

Paul quotes this in his letter to the Hebrews in these words:

But a body hast thou prepared me.¹

One of these two statements must be wrong and manipulated. The Christian scholars are surprised at it. Henry and Scott's compilers said:

This is a mistake of the scribes. Only one of the two statements is true.

They have admitted the presence of alteration in this place but they are not definite which of the two statements has been changed. Adam Clarke ascribes the change to the Psalms. D'Oyly and Richard Mant observe in their comments:

It is surprising that in the Greek translation and in the Epistle to the Hebrews 10:5 this sentence appears as: 'but a body hast thou prepared me.'

1. Heb. 10:5.

The two commentators agree that it is the statement of the Evangel that has been altered, that is, the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews.

Alteration No. 9

Verse 28 of Psalm 105 in the Hebrew version includes the statement: "They rebelled not against his words." The Greek version on the contrary bears these words: "They rebelled against these words." It can be seen that the former version negates the latter. One of the two statements, therefore, must be wrong. Christian scholars are greatly embarrassed here. The commentary of Henry and Scott concludes:

This difference has induced much discussion and it is obvious that the addition or omission of a certain word has been the cause of all this.

The presence of manipulation in the text has been admitted, though they are not able to decide which version is wrong.

Alteration No. 10: The Number of the Israelites

II Samuel contains this statement:

And there were in Israel eight hundred thousand valiant men that drew the sword; and the men of Judah were five hundred thousand men.¹

This statement is contradicted by I Kings:

And all they of Israel were a thousand thousand and a hundred thousand men that drew sword.

Certainly one of the two statements has been altered. Adam Clarke making his comments on the first statement observed:

1. II Samuel 24: 9.

The validity of both the statements is not possible. Most probably the first statement is correct. The historical books of the Old Testament contain more distortions than the other books. Any effort to find conformity among them is just useless. It is better to admit, in the beginning, what cannot be refuted later. The authors of the Old Testament were men of inspiration but the copiers were not.

This is a plain admission of the fact that alterations are abundant in the books of the Old Testament and that one should objectively admit their presence because these changes and contradictions are unexplainable.

Alteration No. 11: Horsley's Admission

The famous commentator, Horsley, under his comments on Judges 12:4 observed on page 291 of the first volume of his commentary:

There is no doubt that this verse has been distorted.

The verse referred to is:

Then Jephtah gathered together all the man of Gilead and fought with Ephraim: and the men of Gilead smote Ephraim, because they said, Ye Gileadites are fugitives of Ephraim among the Ephraimites and among the Manassites.

Alteration No. 12: Four or Forty

II Samuel 15:7 contains:

And it came to pass after forty years that Absalom said unto the King...

Here the word 'forty' is undoubtedly wrong; the correct number is four. Adam Clarke said in volume two of his book:

There is no doubt that this text has been altered.

Alteration No. 13: Kennicott's Admission

Adam Clarke observed in volume 2 of his commentary under the comments on II Sam 23:8:

According to Kennicott three alterations have been made in this verse.

This is a plain admission that a single verse contains three distortions.

Alteration No. 14

I Chronicles 7:6 informs us as follows:

The sons of Benjamin; Bela, and Becher, and Jediael, three.

While in chapter 8 it says:

Now Benjamin begat Bela, his first born, Ashbel the second and Aharah the third Noahah the fourth and Repha the fifth.

These two different statements are again contradicted by Genesis 46:21:

And the sons of Benjamin were Belah, and Becher, and Ashbel, Gera and Naaman, Ehi and Rosh, Muppim and Huppim and Ard.

It is quite easy to see that there are two kinds of differences in the above three statements. The first passage informs us that Benjamin had three sons, the second claims he had five while the third counts them as ten. Since the first and the second statements are from the same book, it shows a contradiction in the statements of a single author, the Prophet Ezra. Obviously only one of the two statements can be accepted as correct making the other two statements false and erroneous. The Judaeo-Christian scholars are extremely embarrassed

and, seeing no way out, they put the blame on the Prophet Ezra. Adam Clarke said with regard to the first statement:

It is because the author (Ezra) could not separate the sons from the grandsons. In fact any effort to reconcile such contradictions is of no use. Jewish scholars think that the author Ezra did not know that some of them were sons and the others grandsons. They also maintain that the genealogical tables from which Ezra had copied were defective. We can do nothing but leave such matters alone.

This is an obvious example of how the Christian as well as the Jewish scholars find themselves helpless and have to admit the errors in Ezra's writings.

The above admission of Adam Clarke helps us to conclude many points of great significance. But before going into those points we must remind ourselves that it is the unanimous claim of both Jewish and Christian scholars that the Book of Chronicles was written by Ezra with the help of the Prophets Haggai and Zechariah. This implies that these two books have the unanimous witness of the three Prophets. On the other hand we have historical evidence that all the books of the Old Testament were in a very bad condition before the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar and after his invasion there was no trace of them left but their names. Had Ezra not recompiled them, they would have ceased to exist then and there. The above fact is admitted in the book which is ascribed to the Prophet Ezra.¹ Although the Protestants do not believe it to be inspired, they nevertheless acknowledge it as a document of historical value. In it we find:

The Torah was burnt. No one knew anything of it. It is said that Ezra rewrote it guided by the Holy Spirit.

1. Perhaps the author is referring to the book of Esdras because it is the book containing these events. It may be noted that this book is not included in the Protestant Bible. However, it is part of the Catholic Bible. In the Knox version of the Catholic Bible there are ten chapters in the first book of Esdras and thirteen in the second book. I was unable to find this passage in the books of Esdras. The statement has been translated from Urdu. (Raazi).

Clement of Alexandria said:

All the divine books were destroyed. Then Ezra was inspired to rewrite them.

Tertullian observed:

It is generally believed that Ezra recomposed these books after the invasion of the Babylonians.

Theophylactus said:

The Holy Books completely disappeared. Ezra gave new birth to them through inspiration.

The Catholic, John Mill, observed on page 115 of his book printed at Derby in 1843:

All the scholars unanimously agree that the original Torah (Pentateuch) and other original books of the Old Testament were destroyed by the forces of Nebuchadnezzar. When the books were recompiled through Ezra, these too were later on destroyed during the invasion of Antiochus.

Keeping the above information in mind will help us understand the significance of the following six conclusions based on the observations of the commentator, Adam Clarke.

First Conclusion:

The present Torah (the Pentateuch) cannot be the original Torah that was first revealed to Moses and then, after having been destroyed, rewritten by Ezra through inspiration. Had it been the original Torah, Ezra could have not opposed it in his writings,¹ and must have copied according to it, without trusting its defective genealogical tables as he did and without distinguishing right from wrong.

The contention that Ezra copied it from the defective versions

1. That is the Book of Chronicles would have not contradicted the book of Genesis which is the part of the Torah.

available to him at the time, and was unable to remove errors contained in them, exactly as he was unable to do in the case of the defective genealogical tables, makes it lose its divine character and, therefore, its trustworthiness.

Second Conclusion:

If Ezra could have made mistakes in spite of being assisted by two other Prophets, he could have made mistakes in other books also. This kind of situation leaves one in doubt about the divine origin of these books, especially when it happens to contrast with definitely established arguments and simple human logic. For example we must reject the truth of the disgraceful event described in chapter 19 of Genesis where the Prophet Lot is imputed to have committed fornication with his two daughters, resulting in their pregnancy, and then two sons being born to them who later become the forefathers of the Moabites and Ammonites. (May God forbid).

Similarly we must reject the event described in I Samuel chapter 21 where the Prophet David is accused of fornication with the wife of Uriah, making her pregnant, and of killing her husband under some pretext and taking her to his house.

There is another unacceptable event described in I Kings chapter 11 where the Prophet Solomon is reported to have converted to paganism, misguided by his wives, and to have built temples for idols thus becoming low in the eyes of God. There are many other obscene and shameful events described in the Bible which make the hair of the faithful stand on end. All these events have been rejected by irrefutable arguments.

Third Conclusion:

Protestant theologians claim that, although the Prophets are not generally immune from committing sins and making mistakes, in preaching and writing they are innocent of and immune to all kinds of errors and omissions. We may be allowed to remind them that this claim remains unsupported by their holy books. Otherwise they should explain why the writing of the Prophet Ezra is not free from

errors especially when he had the assistance of two other Prophets.

Fourth Conclusion:

This allows us to conclude that according to the Christians there are times when a Prophet does not receive inspiration when he needs it. The Prophet Ezra did not receive inspiration while he most needed it at the time of writing these books.

Fifth Conclusion:

Our claim that everything written in these books is not inspired by God has been proved because a false statement cannot be an inspiration from God. The presence of such statements in the Bible has been demonstrated above.

Sixth Conclusion:

If the Prophet Ezra is not free from error, how can the Evangelists Mark and Luke be supposed to be immune to error, especially when they were not even disciples of Christ? According to the People of the Book, Ezra was a Prophet who received inspiration and he was assisted by two other Prophets. Mark and Luke were not men of inspiration. Though the other two Evangelists, Matthew and John, are considered by the Protestants to be Apostles, they too are not different from Mark and Luke since the writings of all four evangelists are full of errors and contradictions.

Alteration No. 15

Under his comments on I Chronicles 8:9 Adam Clarke observed in the second volume of his book:

In this chapter from this verse to verse 32, and in chapter 9 from verse 35 to 44 we find names which are different from each other.¹ Jewish scholars believe that Ezra had found two books which contained these verses with names different from each other. Ezra could not distinguish the correct names from the wrong ones; he therefore copied both of them.

1. We have discussed these names in an earlier volume.

We have nothing to add in respect of this to what we said under the previous number.

Alteration No. 16

In II Chronicles 13:3 we find the number of Abijah's army mentioned as four hundred thousand and the number of Jeroboam's army as eight hundred thousand, and in verse 17 the number of people slain from Jeroboam's army is given as five hundred thousand. Since this number of the troops of the above kings was incredibly exaggerated, they have been reduced to forty thousand, eighty thousand and fifty thousand respectively in the most Latin translations. It is surprising that the commentators have willingly accepted this. Home said in the first volume of his commentary:

Most probably the number described in these (the Latin) versions is correct.

Similarly Adam Clarke in the second volume of his book said:

It seems that the smaller number (the reduced number in the Latin translations) is quite correct. And we are thus provided with great opportunity to protest against the presence of distortion in the numbers described by these historical books.

This is again an unambiguous example of alterations made in the texts of the Bible.

Alteration No. 17: The Age of Jehoiachin

We find this statement in II Chronicles:

Jehoiachin was eight years old when he began to reign.¹

The word 'eight' in this verse is incorrect and is contrary to the statement of II Kings which says:

1. II Chron. 36:6.

Jehoiachin was eighteen years old when he began to reign.¹

In his comments on the latter verse Adam Clarke said:

The word 'eight' used in 2 Chronicles 36:8 is certainly wrong, because he reigned for only three months and was then made captive in Babylon where he had his wives in the prison. It seems obvious that a child of eight years could not have had wives with him. A child of this age cannot be accused of committing an act which is evil in the eyes of God.

Alteration No. 18

According to some versions Psalm 20 verse 17, and according to the Hebrew version, Psalm 22 verse 16, includes this sentence:

My both hands are like a lion.

In the Catholic and the Protestant translations the sentence reads:

They pierced my hands and my feet.

All the scholars admit the presence of an alteration at this place.

Alteration No. 19

Under his comments on Isaiah 64:2,² Adam Clarke said in volume 4 of his book:

At this place the Hebrew text has undergone a great alteration, the correct sentence should be: the fire causeth the wax to melt.

1. II Kings 24:8.

2. "And when the melting fire burneth, the fire causeth the waters to boil, to make thy name known to thine adversaries, that nations may tremble at thy presence." (Isaiah 64:2)

Alteration No. 20: Difference between Isaiah and Paul

Verse 4 of the same chapter contains:

For since the beginning of the world men have not heard, nor perceived by the ear, neither hath the eye seen, O God, besides thee, what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for him.

But Paul records this verse differently in his first letter to Corinthians, saying:

Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.

The difference between the two texts is obvious and one of the two statements must be wrong. The commentary of Henry and Scott contains this statement:

The best opinion is that the Hebrew text has been distorted.

Adam Clarke reproduced many opinions on this text of Isaiah and examined the text thoroughly, at the end of which he observed:

What can I do under these difficult circumstances except present one of two alternatives to my readers: admit that the Jews changed the texts of the Hebrew and Latin translations, as a strong probability exists of alterations in the quotations of the Old Testament reproduced in the New Testament; or admit that Paul did not quote this sentence from this book. He might have quoted it from one of several forged books. For instance from the Book of the Ascension of Isaiah or from the revelations of Ebiah where this sentence can be found, because some people think that the apostle (Paul) copied from forged books. Perhaps people generally would not easily accept the first possibility, but I must warn the readers that Jerome considers the second possibility to be the worst kind of heresy or heterodoxy.

Alterations No. 21-26: Differences between the Old and New Testaments

We find Horne observing in the second volume of his commentary:

It seems that the Hebrew text has been changed in the verses detailed below:

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Malachi 3:1 | 2. Micah 5:2 |
| 3. Psalms 16:8-11 | 4. Amos 9:11-12 |
| 5. Psalms 4:6-8 | 6. Psalms 110:4 |

1. The first verse in Mal. 3:1 seems to have been altered because Matthew reports it in his Gospel in chapter 11:10 in a form which is obviously different from Malachi's in the Hebrew and other translations. The text of Matthew is this:

Behold, I send my messengers before ye...

The words 'before ye' are not to be found in Malachi.¹ Besides this Matthew also reported these words, "Shall prepare the way before ye." While Malachi's statement is, "Shall prepare the the way before me." Horne admitted in a footnote:

This difference cannot be explained easily except that the old versions had been changed.

2. The second verse (Mic. 5:2) is also quoted by Matthew in 2:6 in a way which shows clear differences² from the above.

3. The third passage (Psalms 16:8-11) is reported by Luke in Acts 2:25-28, and the texts are quite different from each other.

1. Malachi's text is this: "Behold, I will send my messengers and he shall prepare the way before me."

2. In Micah the city of Judah is described as a small city while in Matthew this is negated.

4. The fourth passage is also quoted by Luke in Acts 15:16-17 and is different from Amos 9:11-12.

5. Psalms 4:6-8 is quoted by Paul in his letter to the Hebrews in verses 5 to 7. The two versions are quite different.¹

Alterations No. 27-29: Contradictory Margin Notes

Exodus 21:8, in the Hebrew version, contains a negative statement while the statement included in its margin is affirmative.

This verse contains injunctions with regard to keeping maid servants.

Similarly we find in Leviticus 11:21 laws regarding birds and creeping things on the earth.² The statement in the Hebrew text is negative while in the marginal notes it is found to be affirmative.

* Leviticus 25:30 gives injunctions with regard to selling houses. The verse again contains a negative injunction while the marginal note affirms it.³

Protestant scholars have preferred the affirmative texts in the marginal notes in their translations in all the above three places. That is, they have omitted the primary text and have included a marginal passage in its place, thus distorting these verses. After the alteration in these three verses, the injunctions contained in them have lost their certainty. Now it cannot be ascertained which of the two injunctions is correct, the negative one of the text or the affirmative of the margin. This demonstration also refutes the claim of the Christians that the distortions found in the Bible do not affect rituals and liturgical instructions.

1. We could not find any difference at this place but since Horne is considered a great scholar by the Christians his statement might have been based on some reason, it has therefore been included.

2. "Yet these may ye eat of every flying creeping thing that goeth upon all four, which have legs above their feet to leap withal upon the earth."

3. "And if it not be redeemed within the space of a full year, then the house that is in the walled city shall be established for ever to him that bought it throughout his generations. It shall not go out in the jubile." Leviticus 25:30.

Alteration No. 30

Acts 20:28 says:

To feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

Griesbach observed that the word 'God' used here is wrong; the correct word is the pronoun 'his',¹ the third person singular.

Alteration No. 31: Angel or Eagle

Revelation 8:13 contains this statement:

And I beheld an angel flying.

Griesbach has suggested that the word 'angel' here is wrong, the correct word should be 'eagle'.²

Alteration No. 32

Ephesians 5:21 contains:

Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.

Griesbach and Scholtz observed that the word 'God' here is again wrong; the correct word should be 'Christ'.³

In this section we have aimed at demonstrating the presence of human manipulation in the form of alterations of phrases and words in the Bible. The above thirty-two examples should be enough to prove it. We confine ourselves to this much only to avoid unnecessary

1. In the present Urdu version it has been changed to the pronoun 'his' but in the King James version printed in 1962 the word 'God' still exists while in the new English translation, printed in 1961, it has been changed to 'his'.

2. The King James version contains 'angel' but the new translations have the word 'eagle'.

3. The same applies as in the previous example. The King James version contains 'God' while subsequent English translations have the word Christ.

prolongation of the subject; otherwise there is no dearth of them in the Bible.

ADDITIONS TO THE TEXT OF THE BIBLE**Addition No. 1: Added Books**

It must be noted in the beginning of this section that the following eight books of the Old Testament remained inauthentic and were rejected up until 325.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. The Book of Esther | 2. The Book of Baruch |
| 3. The Book of Judith | 4. The Book of Tobit |
| 5. The Book of Wisdom | 6. The Book of Ecclesiasticus |
| 7 & 8. The First and Second Book of Maccabees | |

In 325 Constantine called a meeting of Christian scholars in the city of Nice (Nicaea) which is known as the Council of Nicaea to decide which of these books should be discarded from the acknowledged list of biblical books. After a detailed scrutiny, this council decided that only the Book of Judith was to be acknowledged as authentic and the rest of the books were declared doubtful.

Another council with the same purpose was held at Laodicea in 364. This committee confirmed the decision of the Nicaean council and unanimously decided that the Book of Esther was also to be included in the acknowledged books. This council publicised its decision through an official declaration.

In 397 another grand council was convened in Carthage. One hundred and twenty-seven great scholars of the time participated in this council. The learned and the most celebrated theologian of the Christian world, St. Augustine, was among the participants. This council not only confirmed the decisions of the previous councils but also unanimously decided to acknowledge all the remaining six books with the proviso that the Book of Baruch was not a separate book but merely part of the book of Jeremiah, because Baruch was the assistant of the Prophet Jeremiah. Its name, therefore, did not appear separately

in the list.

Three more subsequent meetings were held in Trullo, Florence and Trent. These councils reacknowledged the decision of the previous councils. In this way all the above eight books after being rejected received the status of Holy Books under the declaration of the above councils. This situation remained unchanged for more than eight hundred years.

Later there was a great revolution over this situation and the Protestants came forward to change the decisions of their forebears and decided that the books of Baruch, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and the two books of Maccabees were all to be rejected. They also rejected the decision of their elders with regard to a particular part of the book of Esther and accepted only one part of it, with the result that out of sixteen chapters of this book the first nine chapters and three verses of chapter 10 were acknowledged and the remaining six chapters and ten verses of chapter 10 were rejected. They forwarded many arguments in support of their decision.

For example the historian Eusebius decided in chapter 22 of the fourth volume of his book:

These books have been distorted, especially the Second Book of Maccabees.

Nor do the Jews recognise these books as being inspired. The Roman Catholics, who have always been greater in number than the Protestants, acknowledge these books up to this day as being authentic and divine. The books have been included in the Latin version that is considered by them to be the most authentic of all versions.

Knowledge of the above facts, proves the presence of distortion and human manipulation in these books. Having been rejected for three hundred and twenty-five years these books suddenly turn out to be inspired books simply because some people sat together in several meetings and decided that they were. The Catholics still insist on their being divine. This implies that any consensus of the Christian scholars lacks value as an argument against opponents. If such a consensus can authenticate previously rejected books, one may be allowed to

presume that the same kind of consensus might have been held in case of the four Gospels which themselves contain many distortions and human manipulations.

The elders first unanimously agreed on the accuracy of the Hebrew version and then claimed that the Jews had changed it in 130 AD as we have shown under Alteration No. 2. The Greek and Eastern Churches still agree on its accuracy, but Protestant scholars have proved that their consensus was wrong, and have shown that, on the contrary, the Hebrew version is incorrect and altered. The same is the case with the Greek translation. The Catholics, similarly agreed on the accuracy of the Latin translation while, contrary to this, the Protestants have not only proved it to be distorted and changed but have also said that its distortion is so great that cannot be compared with other translations. Home observed on page 463 of the fourth volume of his commentary printed in 1822:

This translation has undergone innumerable alterations and frequent additions from the 5th century to the 15th century.

Further on page 467 he observed:

It may be kept in mind that no other translation in the world has been so greatly distorted as was the Latin translation. The copiers took great liberties in inserting the verses of one book of the New Testament into another and including marginal notes into the basic text.

In the presence of this attitude towards the most popular translation, what assurance is there that they might have not changed the basic text of a translation which was not popular among them. It can be assumed that people who were bold enough to change a translation, would have also tried to change the original version to cover their crime.

Strangely the Protestants did not reject the part of the book of Esther along with all other books, because in this book the name of God does not occur even once, let alone His attributes or injunctions.

Also, the name of its author is not known. The exegetes of the Old Testament do not ascribe it to anyone with certainty. Some of them ascribe it to the ecclesiastics of the Church from the period of Ezra to the period of Simeon. The Jewish scholar Philo thinks that it was written by Jehoiachin, the son of Joshua who had returned from Babylon after his release from captivity. Augustine attributed it directly to Ezra, while some others relate it to Mordecai some others even think that Mordecai and Esther are the authors of this book. The *Catholic Herald* contains the following remarks on page 347 of vol. 2:

The learned Melito did not include this book in the list of acknowledged books, as has been pointed out by Eusebius in the *History of the Church* (Vol. 4 Chapter 26). Gregory Nazianzen described all the acknowledged books in his *Poem* and this book is not included by him. Similarly Amphilocheus expressed his doubts about this book in the poem which he addressed to Seleucus and Athanasius rejected and negated it in his letter No. 39.

Addition No. 2

The Book of Genesis contains the following:

And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel.¹

These cannot be the words of the Prophet Moses, because they denote that speaker belonged to the period after the Israelites had formed their kingdom.² The first king of this kingdom was Saul,³ who reigned 356 years after the death of the Prophet Moses. Adam Clarke remarked in the first volume of his commentaries:

I am almost certain that this verse and the subsequent verses up to verse 39 were not written by Moses. In fact,

1. Gen. 36:31.

2. This kingdom was formed centuries after the death of Moses and the speaker must belong to this period.

3. This Saul is the same king who is named in the Qur'an as 'Talut'.

these verses belong to the first chapter of I Chronicles, and a strong possibility, which is very near to being a certainty, is that these verses were written in the margin of the original Pentateuch. The copier included them in the text on the assumption that they formed a part of the text.

This commentator has admitted that the above nine verses were added to the text later. This proves that their holy books were capable of allowing foreign material to be inserted later, otherwise these later additions would have not become a part of all the translations.

Addition No. 3

We find the following statement in Deuteronomy:

Jair, the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi, and called them after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair unto this day.¹

It is also not possible for this to be the word of Moses, because the words 'unto this day' in the above verse situate the speaker in a period much later than that of Jair, because such phrases can be used only to denote the remote past. The renowned scholar Horne made the following comments on both the above verses in the first volume of his commentary:

It is not possible for these two verses to be the word of Moses, because the former sentence denotes that the speaker belongs to the period after the Kingdom of Israel had been founded while the latter verse shows that the author belonged to a period long after the stay of the Israelites in Palestine. Even if we accept these two verses as later additions, the truth of the book still remains unaffected. A careful examination of these verses will show that they are of great advantage, rather they carry more weight than the text itself, especially the second verse, because the author, be he Moses or someone else,

1. Deut. 3:14.

could not say 'unto this day'; it is therefore most predominantly presumed that the original text was: "Jair, the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi and called them after his own name, and after a few centuries these words were added in the margin to let the people know that this land still continued to be known by the same name. This note then was added into the text in future translations. Anyone with doubt can ascertain from the Latin version the fact that some later additions which are found in the text of some translations are present in the margin of others.

The above scholar has openly admitted that the above two verses are not the word of Moses and that they are later additions. As for his assumption regarding what the above verse would have been, it is merely personal guesswork that is not supported by argument. He has admitted that these words were inserted into the text 'a few centuries later' and then became the part of other translations. This is a clear admission that these books allowed the possibility of such insertions being made, and that is not a character of divine books. His claim that the truth remains unaffected even after this distortion, is nothing but sheer obstinacy and is rejected by common sense.

The compilers of Henry and Scott's commentary observed with regard to the second verse:

The last sentence is an addition that was inserted long after the period of Moses. It makes no difference if we overlook it.

Addition No. 4: The Towns of Jair

The Book of Numbers chapter 32 verse 40 says:

And Jair the son of Manasseh went and took the small towns thereof, and called them Havoth-Jair.

This verse is similar to the verse of Deuteronomy discussed above. *The Dictionary of the Bible* printed in America, England and India,

the compilation of which was started by Colmet and completed by Zabiti and Taylor, contains the following:

There are certain verses in the Pentateuch which are clearly not the word of Moses. For instance, Numbers 32:40 and Deuteronomy 2:14. Similarly some of its passages do not correspond to the idiom or expression of the time of Moses. We cannot be certain as to who included these verses. However there is strong probability that Ezra inserted them as can be understood from chapter 9:10 of his book and from chapter 8 of the Book of Nehemiah.

The above requires no comment. It gives us to understand that the Torah (Pentateuch) contains passages that are not the word of Moses. The scholars are not definite about the authors of these books but they conjecture that they might have been written by Ezra. This conjecture is not useful. The previous chapters do not indicate that Ezra inserted any part into the book. The Book of Ezra¹ contains his admission and concern over the perversion of the Israelites while the Book of Nehemiah² informs us that Ezra had read the Torah to the people.

Addition No. 5: The Mount of the Lord

We read in Genesis:

It is said to this day, In the Mount of the Lord it shall be seen.³

We historically know that this mount was called 'The Mount of the Lord', only after the construction of the temple, built by Solomon four hundred and fifty years after the death of Moses. Adam Clarke decided in his introduction to the Book of Ezra, that this sentence is a later addition, and said:

-
1. Ezra chapter 9.
 2. Nehemiah chapter 8.
 3. Gen. 22:14.

This mount was not known by this name prior to the construction of the Temple.

Additions No. 6 & 7: Further Additions to Deuteronomy

It says in Deuteronomy chapter 2 verse 12:

The Horims also dwelt in Seir before-time; but the children of Esau succeeded them, When they had destroyed them from before them and dwelt in their stead; as Israel did into the land of his possession which the Lord gave unto them.

Adam Clarke decided in his introduction to the book of Ezra that this verse is also a later addition and the sentence "as Israel did unto the land of his possession" is said to denote it.

Deuteronomy chapter 3 verse 11 has:

For only Og, King of Bashan remained of the remnant of giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? Nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man.

Adam Clarke observed in his introduction to the book of Ezra:

The whole statement, and especially the last sentence, indicates that this verse was written long after the death of this king and certainly was not written by Moses.

Addition No. 8

The book of Numbers contains:

And the Lord hearkened the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites; and they utterly destroyed them and their cities and he called the name of the place Hormah.¹

1. Numbers 21:3.

Adam Clarke again observed on page 697 of his first volume:

I know very well that this verse was inserted after the death of Joshua, because all the Canaanites were not destroyed in the time of Moses, they were killed after his death.

Addition No. 9

We find in the Book of Exodus:

And the children of Israel did eat 'manna' forty years until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna until they came to the borders of the land of Canaan.¹

This verse also cannot be the word of God, because God did not discontinue 'manna' in the lifetime of Moses, and they did not arrive at Canaan in that period. Adam Clarke said on page 399 of the first volume of his commentary:

From this verse people have reckoned that the Book of Exodus was written after the discontinuance of Manna from the Israelites, but it is possible that these words might have been added by Ezra.

We may be allowed to assert that people have reckoned rightly, and the unsupported conjecture of the author is not acceptable. The fact is that all the five books ascribed to Moses (the Torah) are not his writings as we have proved in the first part of this book with irrefutable arguments.

Addition No. 10: The Book of the Wars of the Lord

Numbers chapter 21 verse 14 says:

Wherefore it is said in the book of the wars of the Lord, what he did in the Red Sea, so shall he do in the brooks of

1. Ex. 16:35.

Amon.¹

It is not possible for this verse to be the word of Moses and, on the contrary, it denotes that the Book of Numbers was not written by Moses at all, because the author has referred to the Book of Wars of the Lord. No one knows anything about the author of this book, his name or his whereabouts up to this day, and this book is something like a fairy tale, heard of by many but seen by none. In the introduction to Genesis, Adam Clarke decided that this verse was a later addition, then he added:

It is most probable that 'the book of the wars of Lord' first existed in a margin, then it came to be included in the text.

This is again a plain admission of the fact that these holy books were capable of being distorted by people.

Addition No. 11

Genesis contains the name of the town Hebron in three places.² This name was given to it by the Israelites after the victory of Palestine. Formerly it was called Kirjath Arba,³ which is known from Joshua 14:15. Therefore the author of these verses must have been someone living in the period after this victory and the change of its name to Hebron.

Similarly the book of Genesis 14:14 contains the word Dan which is the name of a town which came into existence in the period of Judges. The Israelites, after the death of Joshua, conquered the city of Laish, and killed the citizens and burnt the whole city. In its place they rebuilt a new town which they called Dan. This can be ascer-

1. This is the translation of the Arabic version. The King James version contains the incomplete sentence, "What he did in the Red Sea, and in the brooks of Amon." The sentence is not predicated.

2. Gen. 13:18, 35:27 and 37:14.

3. "And the name of Hebron before was Kirjath-arba."

tained from Judges chapter 18.¹ This verse therefore cannot be the word of Moses. Horne said in his commentary:

It is possible that Moses might have written Raba and Laish and some copier later changed the names to Hebron and Dan.

It is again to be noted how the great scholars find themselves helplessly seeking support from unsound conjectures.

Addition No. 12

The Book of Genesis says in chapter 13 verse 7:

The Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelt then in the Land.

Chapter 12 verse 6 of the same book contains these words:

And the Canaanite was then in the land.

Neither of these sentences can be the word of Moses, as has been admitted by the Christian commentators. The commentary of Henry and Scott has the following comment:

It is clear that neither of these sentences can be the words of Moses. These and other similar sentences have been added later to make a link and might have been added by Ezra or any other man of inspiration into the holy books.

This is an obvious admission of the fact that the holy books contain passages which have been added to them later by unknown people. His guess that Ezra might have added it invites no comment as no argument has been presented to support this conjecture.

Addition No. 13: The First Five Verses of Deuteronomy

Under his comments on chapter 1 of Deuteronomy, Adam Clarke

1. "And they called the name of the city, Dan, after the name of Dan, their father, who was born unto Israel; how be it the name of the city was Laish." (Judges 18:29)

observed on page 749 of volume 1 of his book:

The first five verses of this chapter form an introduction to the rest of the book and cannot be regarded as the word of Moses. Most probably they were added by Ezra or by Joshua.

This admission shows that these five verses are a later addition. Again his guess with regard to their authors is unacceptable without argument.

Addition No. 14: Chapter 34 of Deuteronomy

Adam Clarke said in the first volume of his Commentary:

The words of Moses end with the previous chapter and this chapter is not his words. It is not possible for Moses to have written it... The person who brought the next book must have been received this chapter from the Holy Spirit. I am certain that this chapter was originally the first chapter of the book of Joshua.¹

The marginal note which existed at this place written by some Jewish scholar said:

Most of the commentators say that the book of Deuteronomy ends on the prayer of Moses for the twelve tribes, that is, on the sentence. 'Happy art thou O Israel who is like unto thee, O peoples saved by the Lord.' This chapter was written by seventy elders long after the death of Moses, and this chapter was the first chapter of the book of Joshua which was later put here.

Both Jewish and Christian scholars have admitted that this chapter cannot be the word of Moses. As for their claim that it was written by seventy elders and that this chapter was the first chapter of the Book

1. The King James version 1862 contains thirty-four chapters in Deuteronomy, the last chapter describing the death of Moses and Joshua's succession to his place. This chapter contains these words, "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses." Obviously Moses could have not described his own death and events pertaining to the period after his death.

of Joshua, this is again just a guess not supported by any argument. Henry and Scott said:

The words of Moses ended with the previous chapter. This chapter is a later addition either by Ezra, Joshua or another subsequent prophet who is not definitely known. Perhaps the last verses were included after the release of the Israelites from the captivity of Babylon.

Similar views were expressed by D'Oyly and Richard Mant in their commentary. They think this was included by Joshua at some later period. It must be noted here that the verses presented above as examples of later additions are based on the presumption that we have accepted the Judaeo-Christian claim that the five books of the Pentateuch are the books of Moses, otherwise these verses would only go to prove that these books have been falsely ascribed to Moses which is what the scholars of Islam believe and claim. We have already demonstrated that some scholars of the Judaeo-Christian world have agreed with our claim. As far as their conjectures as to the author of these verses, they are unacceptable until they support them with authoritative evidence which directly lead us to the Prophet who included these verses, and to do that has proved impossible for them.

Addition No. 15: Irrelevant Verses in Deuteronomy

Adam Clarke reproduced a long exposition of Kennicott in the first volume of his book while commenting on chapter 10 of Deuteronomy that is summarized in the words:

The Samaritan version is correct while the Hebrew version is wrong. Four verses, that is from 6 to 9, are extremely irrelevant¹ in the context and their exclusion from the text produces a connected text. These four verses were written here by mistake by the copier. They, in fact, belong to the sec-

1. The text here contains description of Moses' arrival on the mount while suddenly these verses irrelevantly start describing a journey of the Israelites and the death of Aaron.

ond chapter of Deuteronomy.

Addition No. 16

The book of Deuteronomy contains the following:

A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord, even to his tenth generation shall he not enter in the congregation of the Lord.¹

It is quite obvious that the above cannot be an injunction from God or written by Moses, because in that case neither David nor any of his ancestors up to Pharez would be able enter the congregation of the Lord, because Pharez was a bastard as we know from Genesis chapter 38 and David happens to be in his tenth generation as is known from the first chapter of Matthew. Horsley therefore decided that the words 'To his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of the lord' are a latter addition.

Addition No. 17

The compilers of Henry and Scott's commentary said under their comments on Joshua chapter 4:9:

This sentence² and other similar sentences which are present in most of the books of the Old Testament most probably are later additions.

Similarly there are many places where the commentators have explicitly admitted the presence of additions in these books. For example, the book of Joshua contains such sentences at 5:9, 8:28-29, 10:27, 13:13-14, 14:15 and 16:10.³ Moreover this book has eight

1. Deut. 23:2.

2. "And Joshua set up twelve stones in the midst of Jordan in the place where the feet of the priests which bare the ark of the covenant stood and they are there unto this day." Josh. 4:9

3. All these sentences bear the phrase 'unto this day' denoting that they were not written by Joshua.

other instances¹ of phrases which are proved to have been added later to the original text. If we were to count all such instances in the Old Testament it would require a separate volume.

Addition No. 18: The Book of Jasher

The book of Joshua has:

And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed until the people had arranged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher?²

This verse cannot, in any case, be the word of Joshua because this statement is quoted from the book referred to in the verse, and up to this day its author is not known. We are, however, informed by II Sam. 1:18 that he was either a contemporary of the Prophet David or after him. The compilers of Henry and Scott's commentary maintained that the Book of Joshua was written before the seventh year of David's succession to throne and according to the books of Protestant scholars the Prophet David was born three hundred and fifty-eight years after the death of Joshua.

Addition No. 19

The book of Joshua, describing the inheritance of the children of Gad, says in chapter 13:25:

The land of the children of Ammon, unto Aroer that is before Rabbah.

This verse is wrong and distorted because Moses could not have given any of the land of the children of Ammon to the children of Gad, since he had been prohibited by God from doing so, as is evident

1. G. T. Menley has pointed out that these words appear fourteen times in the book of Joshua. Perhaps on this ground 'Kail' has suggested that this book was written by some unknown man after the death of Joshua. Menley agreed with this.

2. Josh. 10:13.

from Deuteronomy chapter 2.¹ The commentator Horsley had to admit that the Hebrew version must have been changed here.

Addition No. 20

We find the following sentence in Joshua chapter 19 verse 34:

And to Judah upon Jordan toward the sunrising.

This is also wrong because the land of Judah was at a distance toward the south. Adam Clarke therefore said that the alteration made in the text is obvious.

Addition No. 21

The compilers of Henry and Scott's commentary under their comments on the last chapter of the book of Joshua observed:

The last five verses are certainly not the word of Joshua. Rather they have been added by Phineas or Samuel. It was customary among the early writers to make such insertions.

This is again a plain admission of alteration in the original text. Their guess that Phineas or Samuel included them in the text is not acceptable as it is unsupported by argument. As for their remarks that the ancient Christians habitually altered the text, we may be allowed to say that it was the practice of the Jews that deprived these books of their originality. Manipulation of the text was not considered a serious fault by them. Their common practice of playing with the text resulted in serious distortions which were then transferred to other translations.

Addition No. 22

The commentator Horsley says on page 283 of the first volume of his commentary:

1. "For I will not give thee of the land of the children of Ammon." Deut. 2:19

Verses 10 to 15 of chapter 11 of the Book of Judges are later additions.

This might be because the event described in them is different from Joshua 15:13-19. Besides, this event belongs to the lifetime of Joshua while in the Book of Judges it is described as an event happening after his death.

Addition No. 23: Levite or Son of Judah

The Book of Judges,¹ giving the description of a certain man of the family of Judah, uses this phrase, "Who was a Levite." This must be an error as the commentator Horsley said:

This is wrong because, from the sons of Judah, no one can be a Levite.

Houbigant excluded this verse from the text, being convinced that it was a later addition.

Addition No. 24

We read in I Samuel the following statement:

And he smote the men of Beth-she-mesh, because they had looked into the ark of the Lord, even he smote of the people fifty thousand and threescore and ten men.²

This statement is wrong as was observed by Adam Clarke in the second volume of his commentary. After an analytical examination he said:

It seems most likely that an alteration was made to the Hebrew version. Either some words were omitted or, unknowingly or otherwise, the words 'fifty thousand' were added, because such a small town could not possibly have

1. Judges 17:7.

1. I Sam. 6:19.

had a population of fifty thousand or more. Besides which they would have been farmers, busy in their fields. Even more incredible is the claim that fifty thousand people could, at the same time, see into the small box which was kept on a stone in Joshua's field.

He further added:

The Latin version contains the words: seven hundred generals and fifty thousand and seventy men; while the Syrian version says five thousand and seventy men. The historians give only seventy men. George Salmon and other rabbis give a different number. These differences, and the over exaggerated number makes us believe that the text must have been distorted here, either by adding some words or by omitting others.

Henry and Scott's commentary contains:

The number of the men killed, in the Hebrew version, is written upside down. However, even if we overlook this, it is incredible that such a large number of people should commit this sin and be killed in such a small town. The truth of this event is doubtful. Josephus has written that the number of the killed men was only seventy.

All these commentators are unambiguous in admitting that there is distortion at this place.

Addition No. 25

Under his comments on I Samuel 17:18, Adam Clarke points out that:

From this verse to verse 31 of this chapter, verse 41, all the verses from 54 to the end of the chapter, and the first five verses of chapter 18, and verses 9, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19 are not present in the Latin version, while they are present in the Alexandrian copy of this Book. At the end of his commentary

on this chapter Kennicott established that the above verses are not the part of the original version.

In a long discussion he adduced that this verse¹ was a later addition. We reproduce a part of his discussion:

In reply to your question as to when this addition was made, I would say, that it was in the time of Josephus. The Jews, with the purpose of refining the hHoly books, added fictitious prayers, songs and fresh statements to the original text. There are innumerable additions in the book of Esther, the additions regarding wine, women and truth, in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, currently known as the First Book of Ezra, the songs of the three children added to the Book of Daniel, and many other additions in the book of Josephus are all obvious examples of this. It is possible that the above verses originally existed in the margin, and were later on included in the text.

The commentator Horsley says on page 330 of the first volume of his commentary:

Kennicott knows that twenty verses of chapter 17 of Samuel, are a later addition and should be excluded from the text, that is, verses 12 to 31. He hopes that in later versions they will not be included in the text.

We do not understand how the authenticity of these books can be trusted when there are all these admissions of Kennicott and others of people enhancing the beauty of the text by adding material to the original text arbitrarily as they liked. These additions subsequently became part of all the translations through the ignorance or carelessness of the copiers. This shows that the Protestants falsely claim that the Jews did not make any changes in the books, that they were God-fearing people and considered the Old Testament to be the Word of God.

1. I Samuel 17: 18.

The Gospel of Matthew 14:3 contains the following statement:

For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife.

The Gospel of Mark talks about this event in these words:

For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake his brother Philip's wife, for he had married her.¹

The Gospel of Luke contains:

But Herod the Tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, and for all the evils which Herod had done, added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison.²

The name Philip is certainly wrong in all the above three versions. The historical records do not agree that the name of Herodias' husband was Philip. On the contrary, Josephus claimed that his name was also Herod. Since Philip is definitely wrong, Home admitted on page 632 of the first volume of his commentary:

Most probably the word 'Philip' was wrongly written by the copier in the text. It should therefore be excluded from the text. Griesbach has accordingly omitted it.

On the contrary, we think that this is one of the mistakes of the evangelists; the copiers are not responsible for it, as there is no argument to support this presumption. It is incredible to believe that the copiers should make exactly the same mistake in all the three Gospels regarding the same event. This single example of addition in fact, makes three examples as it appears in the three Gospels referred to

1. Mark 6:17.

2. Luke 3: 19-20.

above.

Addition No. 27: Words added to Luke

The Gospel of Luke contains the following words:

And the Lord said, Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation and to what are they like.¹

In this verse the words, "And the Lord said," were added later. The commentator Adam Clarke said about them:

These words were never part of Luke's text. The scholars have rejected them. Bengel and Griesbach excluded these words from the text.

These words have been omitted from the modern English translations while the King James version still contains them. It is surprising that they are still included in the Protestant translations. Words which have been proved to be a later addition have no reason to remain in a text which is supposed to contain the word of God.

Addition No. 28

We find written in Matthew:

Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah, the prophet, saying, 'and they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued.'

The word 'Jeremiah' in this verse is one of the well-known mistakes of Matthew, because this statement can be traced neither to Jeremiah nor any other book of the Old Testament. However, a passage vaguely similar to it is found in the Book of Zechariah 11:13 but there is an obvious difference between the two which makes it difficult to presume that Matthew was quoting it from there. Besides, the

1. Luke 7: 31.

text of the Book of Zechariah has no connection with the event described by Matthew. Christian scholars have diverse opinions on this matter. On page 26 of his *Book of Errors* printed in 1841, Ward said:

Mr. Jewel writes in his book that Mark mistakenly wrote Abiathar in place of Ahimelech, similarly Matthew mistakenly wrote Jeremiah in place of Zechariah.

Horne observed on pages 385 and 386 of the second volume of his commentary printed in 1822:

This quote is doubtful, because the Book of Jeremiah does not contain it though it is found in the Book of Zechariah 11:13 even if the words of Matthew are different from it. Some scholars think that it is an error of Matthew's version and the copier wrote Jeremiah instead of Zechariah; or it may be a later addition.

After having quoted opinions supporting his claim of addition, he said:

Most likely Matthew's text was originally without names as follows: 'Then was fulfilled that which was spoken.' This is supported by the fact that Matthew has the habit of omitting the names of the Prophets when he speaks of them.

And on page 625 of the first volume he said:

The evangelist did not write the name of the Prophet in the original, some copier included it later.

The above two passages bear witness that he believed that the word 'Jeremiah' was added later. The commentary of D'Oyly and Richard Mant contains the following comments with regard to this verse:

The words quoted here are not present in the Book of Jeremiah. They are found in Zechariah 11:13. This may be

because some copier in the past, might have written Jeremiah instead of Zechariah. Subsequently this mistake has found its way into the text, as Pears has confirmed.

Jawad ibn as-Sabat wrote in the introduction of *Al-Buraheen As-sabatiah*:

I asked many missionaries about this verse. Thomas replied that it was a mistake of the copier while Buchanan and others answered that Matthew quoted it simply from his memory without referring to the books. Another priest said it could be that Jeremiah was a second name of Zechariah.

This leads us to believe that Matthew made the mistake¹ as was admitted by Ward, Buchanan and others. Other possibilities are weak and unsupported by arguments. Horne also admitted that Matthew's words do not correspond to the words of Zechariah and, without admitting the error of one book, the other cannot be accepted as correct. We have presented this witness on the presumption that it was the mistake of the copier.

Let us now examine the errors found in the Gospel of Mark as admitted by the Catholic, Ward and Jewel. The text of this Gospel reads:

And he said unto them, Have ye never read what David did when he had need and was an hungered, he and that they were with him? How he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar, the high Priest, and did eat the shewbread, which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to them which were with him.²

The word Abiathar in this passage is wrong as has been admitted by the above-mentioned author. Similarly the following two sentences are wrong: "and that they were with him," and "to them which were

1. R.A Knox, a recent scholar has allowed no ambiguity to admit that Matthew's version has been changed. Commentary on the New Testament.

2. Mark 2: 25,26.

with him.” Because the Prophet David at that time was alone and not accompanied by other people. The readers of the Book of Samuel know this well. These two sentences are therefore wrong. Similarly sentences contained in Matthew and Luke must also be wrong. For example, Matthew 12:3-4 has:

Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungered, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests.

And Luke 6:3,4 contains:

And Jesus answering them said, Have ye not read so much as this, what David did, when himself was an hungered, and they which were with him. How he went into the house of God, and did take and eat the shewbread and gave also to them that were with him. Which is not lawful to eat but for the priests alone.

In quoting the above statement of Jesus, the three evangelists made seven mistakes, if these mistakes are ascribed to the copiers, the distortion in all seven places is proved, though it happens to be against the apparent evidence that it was the the copiers who were at fault.

Addition No. 29

We find in Matthew chapter 27 verse 35:

And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet, ‘They parted my garments among them and upon my vesture did they cast lots.’

The Christian scholars do not accept the sentence, “that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet...” as genuine and Griesbach even excluded it from the text. Similarly Horne presented arguments to prove that it was added later to the text on pages 330

and 331 of his first volume and then remarked:

Griesbach finding out the falsity of this sentence has understandably excluded it from the text.¹

Under his comments on the same verse, in the fifth book of his commentary Adam Clarke said:

It is imperative to exclude this sentence from the text as it is not part of it. Later corrected versions have omitted it, except for a few. Similarly it was omitted by many of the early theologians. It is certainly an addition which has been taken from the Gospel of John 19:24.

Addition No. 30

The First Epistle of John contains the following:

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.²

According to the investigations of Christian scholars the original text was only this:

And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one. There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost.

Griesbach and Sholtz are agreed on its being a later addition. Horne, in spite of all his prejudice decided that these words should be excluded from the text. The compilers of Henry and Scott also followed the opinion of Horne and Adam Clarke.

1. The current Urdu and English versions omit this sentence. The King James version, however, still contains it.

1. I John 5:7-8.

St. Augustine, the great theologian and scholar of the fourth century wrote ten booklets on this epistle but did not include this sentence in any of them in spite of being a great preacher of the trinity and famous for having had many debates with the followers of Arius. Had this been a part of the text, he would have used it to support the trinitarian thesis and have quoted it. We personally think that the note which he added in the margin of this verse, to connect it remotely with the trinity, was found useful by the trinitarians and was later included by them in the text.

In the debate that I had with the author of *Meezan-ul-Haqq* he admitted that this sentence was a later addition. Presuming that I would be quoting some more examples of such distortions, he admitted in the very beginning of the discussion that they acknowledged the presence of distortion in the text at seven or eight places. Horne devoted more than twenty pages to examining this verse and at the end gave a summary of his discussion, which we omit to save the readers from an unnecessarily lengthy exposition. Henry and Scott's compilers gave a summary of the conclusion of Horne which we reproduce below:

Horne has presented the arguments of both the groups; we give a summary of his recapitulation. Those who claim that this passage is false put forward the following arguments.

1. This passage is not found in any of the Latin versions written before the sixteenth century.
2. This text is missing from the other translations carefully examined and printed in early times.
3. It was never referred to by the ancient theologians nor by any historians of the church.
4. The fathers of the Protestant church either have excluded it or called it doubtful.

Those who consider this verse genuine also have a number of arguments:

1. This verse is found in the ancient Latin translation and in

most of the versions of it.

2. This passage is present in the books of Greek doctrine, the prayer-book of the Greek church and the old prayer-book of the English church. It was cited by some early Latin theologians.

The arguments presented in the second group makes us understand the following two points. Firstly, before the availability of printing facilities it was possible for the copiers and opponents to manipulate the text to suit their whims. This is evident from the examples of distortions inserted in the text cited above by the first group. The passage in question was removed from the Greek versions and from all other translations except the Latin translation. Secondly, even the faithful Christians used to make deliberate alterations in the holy texts for theological reasons. When the faithful and the fathers of the faith do not hesitate to change the text, blaming the copiers and the people of other sects cannot be justified. The records show that they did not miss any opportunity of altering the text before the invention of the printing press. In fact, they are still making alterations.

Distortion in Luther's Translation

The founder of the Protestant faith and great theologian, Martin Luther, first translated the holy books into the German language. He did not include this passage in his translation. His translation was printed several times in his lifetime without this passage. In his old age, in 1546 when this translation was being reprinted, Luther, fully aware of the general practice of the Christians, felt it necessary to include in his will regarding this edition that no one should make any changes it. They were not able by their nature to act upon his will and they included this passage in his translation less than thirty years after his death.

The first people to add this passage were the people of Frankfurt when they printed this translation in 1574. Subsequently, either from the fear of God or for other reasons, they again excluded this verse from it. The trinitarians felt this exclusion very badly, and once again

it was added to it by the people of Wittenberg in 1596 and by the people of Hamburg in 1599. Again the people of Wittenberg, for some unknown reason, excluded it from the second edition. From then onward, the Protestants accepted its inclusion in the text. In this way the Protestants unanimously acted against the will of their spiritual father. The famous unitarian scientist, Isaac Newton, wrote a treatise of nearly fifty pages where he proved that this and I Timothy 2:16. are both forged and distorted. The latter verse says:

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles believed on in the world, received up into glory.

Since the above verse also was helpful in establishing the concept of trinity, it was added to the text by the enthusiasts.

Addition No. 31

The Book of Revelation contains the words:

I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day,¹ and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and what thou seest, write in a book.

Griesbach and Sholtz are in agreement on the point that the words, 'the first and the last' are not genuine and were added later. Some translators have omitted them, and in the Arabic translations printed in 1671, and 1821, the words Alpha and Omega were also² omitted.

Addition No. 32

Acts 8:37 says:

1. The Lord's day, that is, Sunday.

2. The present Urdu and English versions do not contain these phrases. We have copied the above verse from the old King James Version.

And Philip¹ said, if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

This verse is also a later addition made by some enthusiast to support the trinity. Griesbach and Sholtz are both agreed on this point.²

Addition No. 33

The Book of Acts contains the following:

And he said, who art thou Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.³

Griesbach and Sholtz agreed that the sentence "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks" is a later addition.

Addition No. 34

The Book of Acts chapter 10 verse 6 contains:

He lodgeth with one Simon, a tanner, whose house is by the seaside. He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do.

Griesbach and Sholtz are positive that the words 'he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do' are later addition⁴ and not genuine.

Addition No. 35

I Corinthians chapter 10 verse 28 says:

1. The disciple of Christ referred to said this to an Ethiopian on the way to Gaza.
2. In the Urdu version this verse has a sign of doubt while the new English version has omitted it and the King James version's list of alternative readings and renderings includes the suggestion 'omit verse'.

3. Acts 9: 5-6.

4. This sentence does not exist in the new English versions.

But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that showed it and for conscience' sake: for the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof.

The last sentence, 'for the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof', is not genuine and is an addition.¹ Horne, after proving this verse to be an addition, said on page 337 vol. 2:

Griesbach, after being sure of its being an addition, excluded it from the text. The truth is that this sentence has no support and is certainly an addition. Most probably it was taken from verse 26.

Adam Clarke said about this sentence:

Griesbach excluded it from the text, and in fact it has no authority.

Addition No. 36

The Gospel of Matthew contains:

A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things.²

The word 'heart' in this verse is an addition.³ Horne, after proving this, said on page 330 of vol. 2 of his book that this word had been taken from Luke 6:45.

Addition No. 37: Addition to the Lord's Prayer

We find in Matthew chapter 6 verse 13:

And lead us not into Temptation, but deliver us from evil:

1. Similar to the previous example this has been excluded from the text in new translations.

2. Matt. 12:35

3. It has been omitted in the present Urdu translation.

For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever.

The words 'For thine is ...' etc.¹ up to the end of this verse are an addition. The followers of the Roman Catholic sect are certain of this fact. It does not exist in the Latin version nor in any of the translations of this sect. The Catholics are very displeased at its addition, and strongly reproach those responsible for it. Ward, the Catholic, said in his *Book of Errors* (printed in 1841) on page 18:

Erasmus greatly condemned this sentence. Bullinger also said that this sentence had been added later and the name of the includer is not yet known. Laurentius Valla and Lamen's claim that this passage was omitted from the word of God has no support of argument. He should have reproached the people who played with the word of God so daringly.

Other scholars have also rejected it. Adam Clarke, who has doubt about its being a later addition, still admits that Griesbach and Wettstein rejected this verse. According to the scholars of both the Catholics and the Protestants, this sentence has been added to the prayer of Christ. This shows that even such a famous prayer could not escape from their practice of distortion.

Addition No. 38

The Gospel of John chapter 7 verse 53 and the first eleven verses of chapter 8 are later additions. Though Horne does not support this²

1. The King James version contains this sentence while the new English translation has omits it.

2. These verses describe a woman accused of adultery being brought to the presence of Christ and people demanding that she be stoned to death. Christ decided that the one without sin among them should throw the first stone at her. The people, convicted by their own consciences, left the place one by one. Christ allowed the woman to go and advised her not to sin again. The new English translation omits this passage from this place but at the end it has been included with a translator's note that these verses have no definite place in the old scriptures. Some other translations do not have this passage at all, while some others place it in Luke after 21:38. Some other translations have even placed it after John 7:36 or 7:53 or 21:24 (New English Bible page 184).

opinion, he still said on page 310 of vol. 4 of his commentary:

The following scholars do not acknowledge the genuineness of this verse: Erasmus,¹ Calvin, Beza, Leclerc, Grotius, Wettstein, Semler, Sholtz, Maurus, Haenlien, Paulinus, Schmidt and many other authors mentioned by Wolf and Koecher.

He further said:

Chrysostom and Theophylactus wrote commentaries on this gospel but they did not include these verses in their comments. Though Tertullian and Cyprian wrote essays on adultery and chastity, they did not seek any support from these verses. Had these verses existed in the versions they had, they must have cited these verses in support.

Ward said:

Some ancient theologians raised objections with regard to the beginning verses of chapter 8 of the Gospel of John.

Norton similarly decided that these verses were certainly a later addition.

Addition No. 39

Matthew 6:18 contains:

And thy father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.

The word "openly" in this verse is an addition. Adam Clarke under his comments on this verse proved it and said:

Since this word had no authority, Griesbach, Grotius, Bengel, and Mill excluded it from the text.

1. Erasmus (1466-1536), the famous sixteenth century scholar; one of the great leaders of the Renaissance.

Addition No. 40

Mark 2:17 contains the words "to repentance"¹ which is also a later addition. This was shown by Adam Clarke with sufficient proofs and he observed:

Griesbach omitted this and Grotius, Mill and Bengel followed him.

Addition No. 41

Similarly Matthew 9:13 also contains the phrase "to repentance" which is a later addition. Adam Clarke after establishing this said:

Mill and Bengel suggested its exclusion, while Griesbach has already excluded it from the text.

Addition No. 42

We find in Matthew:

Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup, that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, we are able. And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with.²

In this verse the statement that "to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with," is a later addition, and similarly the statement, "ye shall be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with," is not genuine.

Adam Clarke, after establishing that both the verses are an addition, said:

According to the rules set by the scholars for distinguish-

1. The new Urdu and English translations do not contain this phrase while the old Arabic and English translations still include it. The list of alternative readings suggests the exclusion of this phrase and also of 6:4 and 6:6 of this Gospel.

1. Matt. 20:22-23.

ing the wrong from the correct text, these two statements do not seem to be a part of the original text.

Addition No. 43

The Gospel of Luke contains:

But he turned and rebuked them and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives but to save them. And they went to another village.¹

The verse beginning with, "For the Son of man....", is not genuine and was added later by an unknown writer. Adam Clarke observed with regard to this verse:

Griesbach excluded this verse from the text. Most likely this passage in old versions was only this much: "But he turned and rebuked them and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. And they went to another village."

OMISSIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE BIBLE

Omission No. 1: The Length of the Israelites' Stay in Egypt

The Book of Genesis contains this statement:

And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years.²

The statement "and shall afflict them four hundred years," and another similar statement contained in verse 14 of the same chapter, which is, "When they shall serve and afterwards shall they come out with great substance," both clearly denote that the land referred to

1. Luke 9:55,56.

2. Gen. 15:13

here is the land of Egypt, because those who afflicted the Israelites and made them their servants and then were punished by God were none but the Egyptians. It was from Egypt that they came out with great wealth. This description does not fit any other place. However, Exodus 2:40 contradicts the above statement:

Now that sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years.

The period of sojourn is different in the two verses. Either the word 'thirty' has been omitted from the first verse or added to the latter. Besides, the period described by both verses is certainly not correct for the following reasons.

Firstly, the Prophet Moses was the grandson of Levi on his mother's side and great grandson on his father's side. On his mother's side he is the son of Jochebed, the daughter of Levi, while on his father's side he is the son of Amran, son of Kohath, son of Levi. This implies that Amran married his aunt, the sister of his father, as is indeed understood from Exodus 6, and Numbers 26. Kohath, the grandfather of Moses was born before the Israelites came into Egypt, a fact which can be ascertained from Genesis 26:11. The period of the Israelites' stay in Egypt cannot therefore exceed 215 years.

Secondly, almost all the Christian commentators and historians are unanimous on the point that the period of the Israelites' stay in Egypt is 215 years. The Arabic book *Murshid at-Talibeen*, written by a Protestant scholar and printed in 1840, contains the chronology of the events from the beginning of the creation to the birth of Jesus. Each event is preceded and followed by a year. The preceding year denotes the number of years from the creation of the world while the following year signifies the number of years from that event to the birth of Jesus. On page 346 of this book, describing the stay of the Prophet Joseph and his father and brothers in Egypt, it says:

2298: Joseph's and his father's stay: 1706.

2513: Crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites and the Drowning of Pharaoh: 1491.

Now a deduction of either of the smaller numbers from the greater ones gives us 215, thus:

$$\begin{aligned} 2513 - 2298 &= 215 \\ 1706 - 1491 &= 215 \end{aligned}$$

Thirdly Paul's letter to the Galatians says:

Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect.¹

This statement is in clear contradiction of the statement found in Exodus, where the total period from the promise to the revelation of the Torah is described as four hundred and thirty years, while this promise to Abraham was made much earlier than the coming of the Israelites to Egypt, and the Torah was revealed to Moses long after their exodus from Egypt. This implies that the total period of their stay in Egypt was much less than 430 years.² Since this statement was erroneous it was corrected in the Greek and Samaritan versions with these words:

And the sojourning of the children of Israel and their forefathers who dwelt in Egypt and Canaan was four hundred and thirty years.

That is, the word "forefathers" and "Canaan" were added to the above text in both the versions. Adam Clarke under his comments on this verse said on page 369 of volume one:

There is unanimous agreement on the fact that the meanings of this verse are obscure and doubtful.

1. Gal. 3:16,17.

2. The total period of stay described by Exodus 12:40 is 430 years.

We may be allowed to contend that the contents of this verse are not obscure and doubtful but they are certainly wrong, as we intend to show very soon. The author further quoted from the Samaritan version and said:

The reading of the text of Alexandrinus is similar to that of the Samaritan version. Many learned scholars have decided that the Samaritan version is the most reliable, as far as the five books of the Pentateuch are concerned. And it is an established fact that the text of Alexandrinus is older and the most authentic of all the Greek translations and Paul's statement is not doubted by any one. Now this matter has been decided by the witness of the above three versions. Besides, there are historical evidences to favour this opinion. Isaac was born 25 years after Abraham's coming to Canaan and Isaac was 60 years old when Jacob was born to him, and Jacob 130 years of age when he came to Egypt. All this adds up to 215 years, which is the total period of stay of the Israelites in Egypt, in this way the total number of years becomes 430 years.

Henry and Scott's compilers also acknowledge that the total period of the stay in Egypt is 215 years. Quoting from the Samaritan version they said:

There is no doubt that this text is correct and explains the difficulties raised by the text.

The above shows that Christian scholars can find no explanation for the above text of Exodus and have to admit its being erroneous. Paul's description as quoted above is also not free from error, because he counted the period from the time of the promise, which is one year prior to the birth of Isaac, as is known from Genesis 17:21 referred to above:

But my covenant will I establish with Isaac which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year.

The Torah was given to them three months after the exodus from Egypt as is described in chapter 19 of Exodus. Now according to the calculations of Adam Clarke this total period comes to 407 years and not 430 years. The same calculations are found in the books of history by Protestant writers which is contrary to what Paul claimed, that is, 430 years. The book '*Murshid at-Talibeen*' says on page 345:

2107: God's covenant with Abraham, change of his name to Abraham, Institution of circumcision. Lot's escape. Death of Hadum, Amra, Adaira and Zebaim on account of their misdeeds. ...1897.

Further on page 347 it records:

2514: Ordination of 'the Laws' on Mount Sinai..1490.
Now the smaller number deduced from the larger gives 407.

$$2514-2107 = 407. \quad 1897-1490 = 407.^1$$

Omission No. 2

The Book of Genesis states:

And Cain talked with Abel, his brother, and it came to pass when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel, his brother, and slew him.²

The Samaritan, Greek, and other ancient translations describe it in these words:

And Cain said unto Abel his brother, Rise let us go into the field, and it came to pass that they were in the field etc.

The phrase, "let us go in the field" is omitted in the Hebrew version. Home said on page 193 of vol. 2, of his commentary:

1. The left side numbers denotes Adam's appearance on Earth while the right side number denotes the year before Christ.

2. Gen. 4:8.

This is present in the Samaritan, Greek, and Syrian versions, as well as in the Latin edition printed in Vulgate and Walton. Kennicott decided that it should be included in the Hebrew version. No doubt this is a good description.

Further on page 338 of the same volume he said:

Sometimes the text of Greek version is more correct but it is not found in the current Hebrew translations. For example the Hebrew translations, printed or handwritten manuscripts, are defective with regard to this verse. And the translator of the English authorised version could not understand this verse. He therefore translated, 'and Cain talked to his brother Abel'. This defect has been made up in the Greek version. This version became similar to the Samaritan, Latin, Syrian and Akola translations, and also to the two commentaries in the two Chaldean languages, and according to the sentence copied by Philo.

Adam Clarke said the same as was said by Home. This passage was included in the Arabic translation of 1831 and 1848.

Omission No. 3

The book of Genesis 7:17 of the Hebrew version contains:

And the flood was forty days upon the earth.

The same sentence appears in many Latin and Greek translations:

And the flood was forty days and nights upon the earth.

Home said in his first volume:

The word "nights" ought to be added in the Hebrew version.

Omission No. 4

Genesis 35:22 in the Hebrew version reads as follows:

And it came to pass when Israel dwelt in that land that Reuben went and lay with Bilhah, his father's concubine and Israel heard it.

The compilers of Henry and Scott said:

The Jews admit that something from this verse has been certainly omitted. The Latin version has supplemented the words with, "he was evil in his sight," to compensate for the omission.

This is clear example of omission in the text as admitted by the Jews which is hardly surprising in view of their normal practice of changing their holy texts.

Omission No. 5

Horsley commenting on Genesis 44:5 said on page 82 of volume one of his commentary:

At the beginning of this verse in the Greek translation the following sentence has been added, "Why hast thou robbed me of my measure."

According to him the above sentence was omitted in the Hebrew version.

Omission No. 6

The Book of Genesis chapter 50 verse 25 contains:

And ye shall carry up my bones from hence.

The Samaritan, Latin and Greek translations and other old versions have it in these words:

And ye shall carry up my bones with ye.

The words "with ye" have been omitted from the Hebrew version.

Horne said:

Mr. Boothroyd has inserted these omitted words in his new translation of the Bible and he has done right.

Omission No. 7

Exodus 2:22 contains:

And she bare him a son, and he called his name Gershom,¹ for he said, I have been stranger in a strange land.

The text of the Greek, Latin and other old translations is followed by the following additional statement:

And a second time also she bare him a son and he called his name Eleazar, for he said the lord of my father helped me and saved me from the sword of Pharaoh.

Adam Clarke, quoting the above passage from the translations said on page 310 of volume one:

Houbigant has included this passage in his Latin translation and claimed that the proper place of this passage was here, while none of the Hebrew versions, printed or manuscript, contains this. It is present in all the authentic translations.

Omission No. 8

The book of Exodus 6:20 says:

And she bare him Aaron and Moses and Mary, their sister.

The words 'their sister' have been omitted in the Hebrew version. Adam Clarke after reproducing the text of the Greek and Samaritan version said:

1. Gershom in the Hebrew language signifies a stranger.

Some great scholars think that these words were present in the Hebrew version.

Omission No. 9

Numbers chapter 10 verse 6 has:

When ye blow an alarm the second time the camps that lie on the south side shall take their journey.

And at the end of this verse in the Greek version it says:

When ye blow a third time then the camps that lie on the west side shall take their journey. And when ye blow a fourth time then the camps that lie on the north side shall take their journey.

Adam Clarke said on page 663 of volume 1 of his commentary:

The west and the north camps are not mentioned, but it seems that they used to make their journey at the blowing of an alarm. It proves that the Hebrew text at this place is defective. The Greek translations added the following sentence, "And when ye blow a third time the camps on the west side shall take their journey, and when ye blow a fourth time that are on the north side shall take journey."

Omission No. 10

Job 42:17 says:

So Job died, being old and full of days.

The Hebrew version ends at this sentence, while the Greek version contains the following additional sentence:

He shall resume life a second time with those whom the Lord shall recover.

It has also been supplemented with short description of Job's

genealogy and other circumstances. Calmet and Harder claim that this supplement is part of the revealed text. This opinion is favoured by Philo and Polyhistor. It was also acknowledged by the people of Origen's time. Theodotion also included this supplement in his Greek translation. This proves that the Hebrew version has been distorted by the omission of the above supplement. Protestant scholars are, however, unanimous on the point that the above supplement is a later addition and not genuine. The compilers of Henry and Scott's commentary said:

Apparently it is a forged description, though it was written some time before Christ.

We may be allowed to ask, if the above passage belongs to the period before Christ, how did the ancient Christians believe it to be the word of God right from the time of the Apostles up to the year 1500, because they acknowledged these translations as genuine, and claimed that the Hebrew version was distorted.

Omission No. 11

Psalm 14 of the Latin, Arabic, Ethiopic and Greek translations contains the following:

Their throat is an open sepulchre, with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips. Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness, their feet are swift to shed blood. Destruction and misery are in their ways and the way of peace have they not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes.

The above description cannot be found in the Hebrew version. It is, however, found in Paul's letter to the Romans. Now either the Jews discarded it from the Hebrew version or the Christians added it in their translations to support Paul's description. In any case it is a distortion either in the form of an omission or in the form of an addition.

Adam Clarke said under his comments on the above verse:

After this verse in the Vatican version of the Ethiopic translation and in the Arabic translation verses have appeared which are present in Paul's letter to the Romans 3:13-18.

Omission No. 12

Isaiah 40:5 in the Hebrew version says:

And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.

While the Greek translations contain these words:

And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall soon see to the salvation of our God for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.

Adam Clarke quoting the above passage of the Greek translations said on page 785 of vol. 4 of his book:

I think that this passage is genuine.

He further said:

This omission in the Hebrew version is very old and even older than the Latin, Chaldean and Syrian translations. This passage is present in all the versions of the Greek translations. Luke also acknowledged it in chapter 3 verse 6.¹ I possess a very old translation where this verse is missing.

Horne said in chapter 8 of vol. 2 of his book:

Luke 3:6 is written according to the Latin translation. Noth (Loth) included it in his translation of the book of Isaiah because he thought it was original.

The compilers of Henry and Scott suggested that:

1. Luke quotes a passage from Isaiah where it is said, "and all flesh shall see it."

It is essential to add the words "the salvation of our God" after the words "shall see". Chapter 53 verse 10 of the Greek translation should be seen.

According to the above commentators the Hebrew text has been distorted by omitting the above verse and Adam Clarke thinks that this distortion is very old.

Omission No. 13

Adam Clarke said commenting on chapter 64 verse 5 of the Book of Isaiah:

I believe that the copier is responsible for the omission in this verse. This distortion is very old. Since the translators of the past were not able to comprehend the meaning of the verse as has been the case with their successors.

Omission No. 14

Horne said in his commentary on page 477:

The Gospel of Luke has omitted a complete verse of chapter 11 from between verses 33 and 34. It is therefore necessary to add part of Matthew 24:36 or Mark 13:32 so that Luke may become similar to the other two Gospels.

Again he said in a marginal note:

All the scholars and commentators ignored this defect in Luke's text, until it was observed by Hales. The above shows clearly that a complete verse has been omitted by Luke which must be added to it. The verse according to Matthew is this: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels of heaven; but my father only."

Omission No. 15

Acts 16:7 says:

But the Spirit suffered them not.

Griesbach and Sholtz said that the correct text is:

But the spirit of Jesus suffered them not.

According to them the word Jesus was omitted. Later, this word was added to the text in the Arabic versions of 1671 and 1821. Now the text in these versions reads:

But the spirit of Jesus suffered them¹ not.

Omission No. 16

The Gospel of Matthew is not Matthew's. The present Gospel of Matthew which is ascribed to him, and happens to be the first Gospel, and is considered to be the earliest, was certainly not written by Matthew. The original Gospel written by him was destroyed long long ago. All the ancient Christians and a number of later scholars are unanimous on the point that the original Gospel of Matthew which was in the Hebrew language was destroyed because it had been distorted by some of the Christian sects.

The Christians do not possess any authority to prove its authenticity and indeed the name of its author is not yet known. Jerome, the most renowned and celebrated scholar among the ancient writers, admitted it. They have only conjectures with regard to its translator which obviously cannot be accepted as an argument. A book cannot be ascribed to a person simply on the basis of unsupported calculations. Now the claim made by Protestant scholars that Matthew, himself, translated it is not valid unless they present some acceptable argument to prove it. Now we will produce some witnesses to prove our claim. *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* vol.19 says:

Every book of the New Testament was written in Greek except the Gospel of Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is certain, on the ground of strong arguments, that these two books were written in the Hebrew language.

1. The current English and Urdu translations also contain this word, while the old English version does not have it.

Lardner stated in vol. 2 on page 119:

Papias observed that Matthew had written his Gospel in Hebrew. Later on everyone translated it according to their own ability.

The above implies that there are many writers who have translated this Gospel. Now unless the writer of the present Gospel is definitely known and it is proved through irrefutable arguments that the writer was a man of inspiration, this book should not be, and cannot be, included among the revealed books. We do not even know the name of its translator let alone whether he was a man of inspiration. Further Lardner said on page 170 of the same volume:

Irenaeus wrote that Matthew wrote his Gospel for the Jews in their language at the time when Paul and Peter were preaching in Rome.

Further he said on page 574 of the same volume:

There are statements of Origen, first written by Eusebius, that Matthew gave the Gospel to the Jews in the Hebrew language; secondly that Matthew wrote his Gospel first for the Hebrews; thirdly that Matthew wrote the Gospel for the Hebrews who were waiting the birth of a man who was promised to the progeny of Abraham and David.

Again he said on page 95 of volume 4 that Eusebius had written that Matthew, after his sermons to the Hebrews who were deciding to go to other communities, wrote his Gospel in their language and gave it to them. And on page 174 of the same volume he says that Cyril said that Matthew wrote the Gospel in the Hebrew language.

And on page 187 of the same volume he said:

Epiphanius writes that Matthew wrote the Gospel in the Hebrew language. He is unique in using this language in writing the New Testament.

Further on page 439 he wrote:

Jerome wrote that Matthew wrote the Gospel in the Hebrew language for believing Jews in a Jewish land. He did not combine the truth of the Gospel with the law.

Again on page 441 he said:

Jerome noted in his list of historians that Matthew wrote his Gospel for believing Jews in the Hebrew script in the land of Jews. It is not yet proved that it was translated into Greek, neither is the name of its translator known. Besides, it must be noted that the copy of his Hebrew Gospel which was collected by Pamphilus with great labour is still present in the library of Syria. I obtained a copy of this Gospel with the help of the assistants in the district of "Barya". They also had this version with them.

Further he writes on page 501 of the same volume:

Augustine said that out of the four Evangelists, only Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language while the others wrote theirs in Greek.

And on page 538 of the same volume he said:

Chrysostom writes that it is said that Matthew wrote his Evangel on the request of believing Jews in the Hebrew language.

And on page 1371 of volume 5 he writes:

Isidore said that only Matthew out of the four evangelists wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language while others wrote theirs in Greek.

Horne said in volume 4 of his commentary that:

Bellarmino, Grotius, Causabon, Walton, Tomline, Cue, Hammond, Mill, Harwood, Owen, Calmet, Michaelis,

Irenaeus, Origen, Cyril, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Jerome and other ancient and modern writers have followed the view of Papias that this Gospel was written in the Hebrew language.

And by 'other' he refers to Gregory Nazianzen, Abed, Theophylactus, Euthymius, Eusebius, Athanasius, Augustine and many others who have been named by Watson and Lardner in their books. D'Oyly and Richard Mant's commentary contains the following:

There was great controversy in the past over the question of the language in which this Gospel was originally written, but many of the ancient writers determined that Matthew had written his Gospel in the Hebrew language and this is therefore now an established point of view.

The compilers of Henry and Scott's commentary said:

The disappearance of the Hebrew version was due to the fact that the Ebionites, who disbelieved the divinity of Christ, made changes in this version. Then after the fall of Jerusalem it disappeared.

Some writers think:

The Nazarenes or the Jewish proselytes altered the Hebrew Gospels, and the Ebionites discarded many sentences from it. Eusebius quoted Irenaeus saying that Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language.

Reuss observed in his *Histoire de l'Evangile*:

Anyone who says that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Greek is wrong because Eusebius in his history and many other theologians of Christianity explicitly mentioned that Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language, and not in Greek.

Norton has written a voluminous book in which he proved that the Pentateuch is not a genuine book and not the one written by Moses.

He acknowledged the Evangel after admitting the presence of many distortions in the Gospels. This is why he is not very popular among the Christians. Since he is a Christian and has quoted many of the ancient writers, it is quite in order to quote at least one passage from him. He writes on page 45 of his book printed in 1837 in Boston in a marginal note:

People believe that Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language, because all the ancient writers referring to this subject are all unanimous on this point. I leave aside the writers who are not considered authentic, and I assert that Papias, Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius and Jerome admitted the fact that this Gospel was written in Hebrew. There is none among the ancients who say anything contrary to this. This is a great witness, indeed, because they, too, were as much prejudiced religiously as the people of modern times. Had there been any room for any doubt in what the ancients said, their opponents led by their prejudices, would have said that the Greek Gospel was the original Gospel and not a translation. We should not reject this ancient and unanimous witness, especially when it does not deprive us of anything. It is therefore necessary that we maintain the belief that Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language. Up to this day I could not find any objection calling for research on this subject. On the contrary I have found valuable witnesses among the ancients to the effect that the Hebrew version of this Gospel, be it genuine or distorted, was with the Christians who were of Jewish race.

The above statements unambiguously prove that Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language and in Hebrew script. The ancient writers are unanimous on this point. Their opinion in this matter is final as was acknowledged by D'Oyly and Richard Mant. They also admitted that the Hebrew version was in existence up to the time of Jerome. It is also clear from the above that the name of its translator is not yet known. Horne, in spite of admitting the above opinion, said that it is most probable that Matthew wrote it in two languages, in

Hebrew and in Greek. This is unacceptable because he has not produced any authority for his assumption.

The opinion of the ancients is also strengthened by the fact that Matthew was one of the Apostles who was an eye-witness of Christ's life and a direct listener to him. Now had he been the author of the present Gospel there must have been an indication somewhere in the Gospel that he is relating his own observations. He would have used the first person somewhere in the Gospel for himself as was the practice of the ancients. The Apostles used the first person for themselves which is evident from the letters that are included in the New Testament, indicating that they are written by them.

Have you not seen the writings of Luke. He wrote his Gospel and the Book of Acts up to chapter 19, through what he heard from others. He uses the first person when referring to himself. For instance when he accompanies Paul on his journeys and writes those circumstances in chapter 20 he refers to himself in the first person. If anyone refutes this by referring to the Pentateuch and the Gospel of John, we would simply say that these two books are of doubtful authenticity¹ as we have shown in the first part of this book. The obvious cannot be denied unless there is a strong argument against it. We also understand from the statement of the compilers of Henry and Scott that this Gospel, in the early period of Christianity, was not considered to be authentic. In that period the Christians were in the habit of changing the texts of their sacred books, (as we have seen earlier). Now when the original text could not be saved from distortions, how can one believe that a translation whose author is not even known can have remained unchanged? Faustus, the celebrated scholar of the Manichaeans, said:

The Gospel which is ascribed to Matthew is not his writing.

1. That is if they claim that Moses has not used the first person for himself in the Pentateuch, we would say that on the basis of sound arguments we do not acknowledge that the present Torah was written by Moses.

Professor Germain said:

The whole of this Gospel is false.

This Gospel was with the Marcionites but the first two chapters were missing from it. They think that these two chapters were added to it later. The Ebionites are of the same opinion. The Unitarian scholars and Father William have rejected both these chapters.

Omission No. 17

Matthew 2:23 contains:

And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophets. He shall be called a Nazarene.

The words, "which was spoken by the Prophets" in the above is one of the famous errors of this Gospel, because it is not found in any of the known books of the Prophets. We would say what the Catholic scholars have said in this matter, that this was present in the books of the Prophets but the Jews, out of their enmity to the Christians, removed all those passages. This is another example of omission; that a certain sect should destroy holy books simply for personal reason. Manfred, a Catholic scholar, wrote a book called *The Questions of the Question* printed in London in 1843, in which he said:

The books which contained this description (quoted by Matthew) have been destroyed, because in any of the present books of the Prophets we do not find the statement that Jesus would be called 'Nazarene.'

Chrysostom said in volume 9 of his book:

Many books of the Prophets have disappeared not because the Jews carelessly lost them, but rather because out of their dishonesty and perversion they burnt these books to ashes.

This statement is very near to the truth. We must keep in mind what Justin said in his polemic against Trypho:

The Jews excluded many books from the old Testament so that the New Testament would appear not to conform with the Old Testament. This shows that many books have been destroyed.

The above leads us to conclude firstly, that the Jews have destroyed many books of the Prophets and secondly, that it was easy to distort holy texts in the past. We have seen that by their burning these books they completely obliterated their existence. In view of their dishonest attitude towards their holy books it is just possible that they might have changed the texts of their books which they thought could be helpful to the Muslims.

Omission No. 18

Matthew 10:11 contains:

And Josiah begat Jeconiah and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon.

This shows that Jeconiah and his brothers are the sons of Josiah and that they were born at the time of their exile to Babylon. All the information given here is erroneous. Firstly because Jeconiah is the son of Jehoiakim, son of Josiah, that is, he is the grandson of Josiah and not his son. Secondly Jeconiah had no brothers. His father, however had three brothers. Thirdly because Jeconiah was not born at the time of exile to Babylon, he was eighteen years old at the time of exile. Adam Clarke said:

Calmet has suggested that the eleventh verse should be read thus: 'Josiah begat Jehoiakim and his brethren and Jehoiakim begat Jechoniah about the time they were carried to Babylon.'

The above implies that Calmet has suggested the addition of the

name of Jehoiakim in the verse, in other words this name has been omitted from this verse. Even then the third objection remains unanswered.

We have produced almost a hundred examples of distortions in the form of alterations additions and omissions in the above three sections. There are many more examples of such distortions in the Bible which we have not produced here to avoid making the present work unnecessarily long. This much is more than enough to prove the presence of distortion in the Bible in all the three forms: alteration, addition, and omission.

REFUTATION OF MISLEADING PROTESTANT STATEMENTS REGARDING THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT

At the beginning of this section we should point out that misleading statements are often made by the Protestant scholars to misguide the general reader with regard to the authenticity of the Christian texts. We intend to provide our readers with answers to five out of many such attempts to mislead.

First Contention

Protestant scholars sometimes try to convince people that the claim of distortion in the Bible is made only by the Muslims and that no such claim is made by anyone else. The fact is that the ancient and later writers of both the Jews and the Christians have claimed the presence of distortions in the Bible more frequently than the Muslims. Before producing witnesses to prove our claim we must mention particularly two terms which are frequently used in their books about the history of the holy books. The two words are 'errata' and 'various readings' (variations in reading). Horne said on page 325 of vol 2:

The best difference between 'errata', an error of a copier, and 'various readings', a variation in the text, is that described by Michaelis who said, 'When there is difference between two or more descriptions only one of them can be true; the rest will be either deliberate distortion or an error of the copier. It is really difficult to separate right from wrong. If there remains any doubt, it is called variation of the text, and when we are certain that the copier has written it wrong we call it 'errata.'

In short there is no great difference between the two terms. A variation in the text is nothing but distortion according to generally accepted terminology. Now any admission to the presence of such variations would obviously be an admission to the presence of distortion.

tion. According to the findings of Mill the number of such variations in the text of the Bible is thirty thousand, and according to Griesbach it is one hundred and fifty thousand and according to Sholtz the number of such variations is innumerable and unknown.

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* under the entry, "Scripture," in vol. 19 includes the statement of Wettstein that the number of such variations in the Bible is one million. With the above in mind, we now proceed to reproduce the opinions of many varied authentic sources regarding this matter.

Observations of Non-Christian Scholars

Celsus was a great pagan scholar of the second century who wrote a book refuting Christianity. A famous German scholar Eichhorn reproduced the following statement of Celsus:

The Christians have changed their Gospels three or four times to the extent that the contents of the Gospels have become distorted.

This is clear evidence coming from a non-Christian scholar, confirming the deliberate distortions made in the Gospels. There are people in European countries who do not believe in prophethood and divine revelation. If we were to try and collect their statements with regard to the distortions it would require a separate volume. We confine ourselves to the presentation of only two. Anyone curious to know more should refer to their books which are easily available all over the world. One of their scholars, Parker said:

The Protestants claim that the Old and the New Testaments have been preserved and protected from the slightest damage through an eternal and everlasting miracle, but this claim is not strong enough to stand against the great army of variations present in the Bible. The number of these is not less than thirty thousand.

He seems to have based his remark on Mill's findings. He avoided

other statements which describe this number as being up to one million. The author of *Ecce Homo* printed in London in 1813 said in the supplement to his book:

This is the list of the books which are ascribed to Jesus by the ancient Christians. Some of them are attributed to the Disciples and other followers:

The Books of Jesus

The books that are ascribed to Jesus are seven in number.

1. The letter that was written to Achars, King of Odessia.
2. Epistle of Peter and Paul.
3. The book of Parables and Sermons.
4. The Psalms, a collection of his cryptic teachings to the disciples and followers.
5. The book of Jugglery and Magic.
6. The book of Jesus and Mary.
7. The Epistle that fell from heaven in the 6th century AD.

The Books of Mary

The books that are ascribed to Mary are eight in number.

1. Her letter to Ignatius.
2. Her letter to Siciliane.
3. The Book of Mary.
4. The biography of Mary and her Sayings.
5. The book of Christ's miracles.
6. The book of questions put to her by the elders and the young.
7. The book of Solomon's ring.

The Books of Peter

The books ascribed to Peter are eleven in number.

1. The Gospel of Peter.
2. The Acts of Peter.
3. The Revelation of Peter I.
4. The Revelation of Peter II.
5. His Epistle to Clement.

6. The discourse of Peter and Epian.
7. The Teaching of Peter.
8. The Sermon of Peter.
9. The Mode of Peter's Prayers.
10. The book of Peter's travels.
11. The book of Peter's inferences.

The Books of John

The books ascribed to John are nine.

1. The Acts of John.
2. The Gospel of John.
3. The book of John's travels.
4. The sayings of John.
5. His Epistle to Andrew.
6. The book of Mary's death.
7. The story of Christ and his descent from the cross.
8. The Apocryphon of John.
9. The Book of John's prayers.

The Books of Andrew

The books ascribed to Andrew are two.

1. The Gospel of Andrew.
2. The Acts of Andrew.

The Books of Matthew

The books ascribed to Matthew are two.

1. The Gospel of Childhood.
2. The Mode of Matthew's Prayers.

The Books of Philip

There are two books ascribed to Philip.

1. The Gospel of Philip.
2. The Acts of Philip.

There is also the Gospel of Bartholomew ascribed to the Disciple

Bartholomew.

The Books of Thomas

The books that are ascribed to Thomas are five.

1. The Gospel of Thomas.
2. The Acts of Thomas.
3. The Gospel of Christ's childhood.
4. The book of Thomas's travels.
5. The book of Thomas's revelation.

The Books of James

The books ascribed to James are three.

1. The Gospel of James.
2. The book of James.
3. The book of of James's travels.

The Books of Matthias

There are three books ascribed to Matthias who is said to have been admitted among the disciples.

1. The Gospel of Matthias.
2. The traditions of Matthias.
3. The acts of Matthias.

The Books of Mark

The books that are ascribed to Mark are three.

1. The Gospel of Egyptians.
2. The Prayers of Mark.
3. The Book of Pishan Barhas.

The Books of Barnabas

Barnabas was a disciple of the Apostles, a descendant of Levi. His name was Joseph, and was called Barnabas because he sold his farm and gave the money to the Apostles for preaching. The word signifies 'son of guidance'.

There are two books ascribed to Barnabas.

1. The Gospel of Barnabas.
2. The Epistle of Barnabas.

The Gospel of Theodotion is ascribed to Theodotion.

The Books of Paul

The number of books ascribed to Paul, apart from those included in the New Testament, is fifteen.

1. The Acts of Paul.
2. The Acts of Thecla.
3. The Epistle to the Laodiceans.
4. The Third Epistle to the Thessalonians.
5. The Third Epistle to the Corinthians.
6. The Epistle of the Corinthians to Paul and his reply to them.
7. His Epistle to the Ionians and their reply to him.
8. The Apocalypse of Paul.
9. The Second Revelation of Paul.
10. The Vision of Paul.
11. The Ascent of Paul.
12. The Gospel of Paul.
13. The Sermon of Paul.
14. The book of Spells of Serpents.
15. The book of Acts of Peter and Paul.

The author of *Ecce Homo* also said:

When the falsity of the Gospels, the Revelations, and the Epistles is so evident, how can it be ascertained that the genuine books are those which are acknowledged by the Protestants, especially with the fact in mind that even these books also had many alterations and additions before the invention of printing machines. The difficulties are really serious.

Observations of Heretical Christian Scholars

The Christian sect of the Ebionites belongs to the time of Paul and flourished in the first century. The Ebionites strongly opposed Paul

and considered him an apostate. Although they acknowledged the Gospel of Matthew they claimed that the present Gospel, attributed to Matthew by the followers of Paul, is quite different from the original Gospel. They also claimed that the first two chapters of the Gospel did not belong to it. According to them these two chapters and many other verses of this Gospel were later additions. The famous historian Bell said with regard to these people:

This sect acknowledged only the Pentateuch of the Old Testament and despised the names of David, Solomon, Jeremiah and Hezekiel. They accepted only the Gospel of Matthew from the New Testament but they changed even this Gospel in many places and excluded its first two chapters.

Similarly the Marcionites were one of the ancient sects of Christianity. They rejected all the books of the Old Testament and denied their being divinely revealed. Likewise they disacknowledged all the books of the New Testament except the Gospel of Luke and the ten epistles of Paul. This gospel, too, was considered by them to be different from the one we know today. The historian Bell said:

This sect used to reject all the books of the Old Testament and only accepted the Gospel of Luke from the New Testament and even of this Gospel they used to reject the first two chapters. They also accepted the ten epistles of Paul but rejected many parts that they did not like in these letters.

Lardner showed in volume 8 of his commentary with regard to alterations made by this sect that they rejected many parts of the Gospel of Luke. The parts of Luke's Gospel which were distorted or omitted by this sect are the first two chapters, the event of the Christ's baptism by John, the genealogy of Jesus in chapter 3, the tempting of Jesus by Satan, his entry into the temple, his reading the book of Isaiah in chapter 4, verses 30, 31, 32, 49, 50 and 51 of chapter 11, the words "but the sign of Jonas, the prophet," verses 6, 8 and 20 of chapter 12, verses 1-6 of chapter 13, verses 11-32 of chapter 15, verses 31, 32 and 33 of chapter 18, verses 28-46 of chapter 19, verses 9-18 of chapter

20, verses 8, 21 and 23 of chapter 21, verses 16, 35, 36, 37, 50, 51 of chapter 22, verse 43 of chapter 23, and verses 26 and 28 from chapter 24. The above details were given by Epiphanius. Dr. Mill added that they also omitted verses 38 and 39 of chapter 4. In volume 3 of his commentary Lardner quotes, through Augustine, the words of Faustus, a great scholar of the Manichaeans in the fourth century:

Faustus says: I totally refute the things that your forefathers have deceitfully added in the New Testament, marring its beauty, because it is an established fact that the New Testament was neither written by Christ nor by his Disciples. The author is an unknown person, who has attributed his work to the Disciples fearing that people would not accept him as an eye-witness of these accounts. Thus he defamed the Disciples by writing books that are full of errors and contradictions.

It can be said without fear of denial that the above scholar, even though he belongs to a heretical sect, is absolutely correct in his above three claims. We have already reproduced Norton's opinion regarding the falsity of the Pentateuch and his claim that the present Gospel of Matthew is not in fact the original book written by him, but only a translation which has itself been altered and distorted.

The above is enough to have an idea of the views of non-Christian scholars and those of Christians who are considered heretics by the majority of other Christians.

Observations of Christian Theologians

We reproduce below the opinions and statements of celebrated and widely trusted scholars and theologians of the Christian world.

Observation No. 1: Adam Clarke

Adam Clarke said on page 369 of vol. 5 of his commentary:

It is customary that the number of the writers on the lives

of great men has always been large. The same is true of Jesus and the Apostles; that is to say the number of narrators of their lives is also great but many of the statements they make are erroneous. They used to write fictional events as if they were facts. They also made mistakes, deliberate or accidental, in other descriptions, especially the historians of the land where Luke wrote his Gospel. For this reason the Holy Spirit imparted appropriate knowledge to Luke so that the faithful might know the true accounts.

This gives us to understand that prior to Luke's Gospel there were many false gospels present replete with errors and mistakes. The above statement is a plain admission of the dishonesty of their authors. His words that they made deliberate or accidental mistakes is enough evidence of this fact.

Observation No. 2: The Apostle Paul

In his Epistle to the Galatians Paul said:

I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel; which is not another but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.¹

The above statement of Paul brings out three important facts, firstly that there was a gospel called the Gospel of Christ in the time of apostles; secondly that there was another gospel that was different and contrary to the Gospel of Christ; and thirdly that there were some people who wanted to distort and change the Gospel of Christ, even in the time of Paul, not to speak of subsequent periods when there was nothing left of this Gospel but its name. Adam Clarke under his comments on the above verse said in vol. 6 of his commentary:

It is established that many minor gospels had become common in the early centuries of Christianity. The abundance

1. Gal. 1:5,6.

of such false and incorrect accounts led Luke to write his Gospel. We read about more than seventy such gospels. Some parts of these gospels are still in existence and available. Many such gospels were collected and published in three volumes by Fabricius. Some describe the obligatory nature of the laws of Moses, the validity of circumcision and imperative-ness of the Gospel.

The above implies that many spurious gospels were present before the compilation of the Gospel of Luke and Paul's letter to Galatians. It also proves that Paul referred to a properly compiled Gospel and not to the meanings that he had conceived in his mind, as sometimes is contended by the Protestants.

Observation No. 3: The Gospel of Christ

The fact that a gospel called the Gospel of Christ existed in the time of the Apostles is certainly true and was also testified to by Eichhorn and many other German scholars. Similarly scholars like Leclerc, Grabe, Michael, Lessing, Niemeyer and Marsh also agree with this opinion.

Observation No. 4: Another Statement of Paul

In his Second Epistle to the Corinthians Paul said:

But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we.

For such are false apostles deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.¹

The above statement of Paul is a clear admission of the fact that there were many false apostles present in his time. Adam Clarke under his comments of this verse said:

1. II Cor. 11:12,13.

They falsely claimed to be the Apostles of Christ while in fact they were not apostles. They used to deliver sermons and take pains in worship but they aimed at nothing but their personal interests.

We read the following in the First Epistle of John:

Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world.¹

John too joined Paul in admitting the presence of false prophets in their time. Adam Clarke made the following comments on this verse:

In the past every teacher used to claim that he received inspiration from the Holy Ghost, because every true prophet received inspiration. The word 'spirit' at this place signifies the man claiming that he was under the effect of the spirit. Put them therefore to test. Such preachers should be examined with arguments. His phrase 'many false prophets' refers to those who were not inspired by the Holy Ghost especially from among the Jews.

The above is enough to show that there were many false claimants to prophethood at that time.

Observation No. 5: The Pentateuch

In addition to the five known books of the Pentateuch there are six more books that are similarly attributed to Moses. These are:

1. The Book of Revelation.
2. The Small Book of Genesis.
3. The Book of Ascension.
4. The Book of Mysteries.
5. The Book of Testaments
6. The Book of Confession.

1. I John 4:1.

The second of the above books existed in the fourth century in Hebrew and Jerome and Cedrenus quoted from it in their books. Origen said:

Paul copied from this book in his letter to the Galatians 5:6. Its translation existed up to the sixteenth century. The Council of Trent declared it false in that century and it continued to be considered so from that time on.

It is surprising that they can acknowledge a certain book as authentic revelation and then, after using it for centuries, suddenly stop liking it and declare it to be false. The holy books are treated by them just like political decisions, being changed at their whim. The third of the above books was similarly acknowledged by the ancients. Lardner said on page 521 of the second volume of his commentary:

Origen claims that Judah copied verse 9 of his letter from this book.

This book is also considered as false like all other books in the list, but it is strange that passages borrowed from these books and inserted into the present book still continue to be considered as revealed. Horne said:

It is thought that these false books were forged quite near the beginning of Christianity.

This scholar has blamed the people of the first century for this forgery.

Observation No. 6: Mosheim's Admission

The historian Mosheim said on page 65 in vol. 1 of his *History* printed in 1832 under his description of the scholars of the second century:

Among the followers of Plato¹ and Pythagoras² it was

1. Plato, the famous Greek philosopher and the teacher of Aristotle. His books on Democracy and Politics are famous (430 - 347 BC).

2. Pythagoras, a Greek philosopher known as the father of mathematics.

considered not only admissible but creditable to tell a lie and deceive others in the cause of truth. As is understood from the ancient books, the first to indulge in this practice were the Jews of Egypt, in the time before Christ. This unholy act was later on borrowed by the Christians, a fact which is clear from the many books that were falsely attributed to great personalities.

We can understand from this why a great number of false books were written and falsely attributed to others in the name of, and in the cause of, truth and religion.

Observation No. 7: Watson and Eusebius

Eusebius said in chapter 18 of the fourth volume of his *History*:

Justin the Martyr related many of the prophecies of Christ and claimed that the Jews excluded them from the Holy Scriptures.

Watson also said on page 32 vol. 2 of his book:

I have no trace of doubt about the passages that Justin quoted in his polemic against a Jew, that, in the time of Justin and Irenaeus, they were part of the Hebrew and Greek versions of the Bible, while today they no longer exist. Especially the text that Justin claimed was part of the Book of Jeremiah. Sylbergius in his annotation of Justin, and Dr. Grabe in his annotation of Irenaeus, pointed out that this prophecy was before Peter when he wrote the text of chapter 4 verse 6 of his epistle.

Horne said on page 62 of the fourth volume of his commentary:

Justin proved that Ezra said to the people, "The Passover is the feast of our Lord, the Saviour. If you keep the Lord superior to the Passover and keep your faith in him, the earth will flourish for ever. If you do not hear and do not keep faith in him you will be ridiculed by other nations."

The above statements are enough to prove that Justin blamed the Jews for excluding many of the prophecies about Jesus from the Holy Books, and that this claim is also supported by other scholars. These prophecies were part of the holy books at the time of Irenaeus and Justin while they are no longer there today. According to Watson the distortion of the holy books is proved because of the additions in the Hebrew and Greek versions.

Observation No. 8: Lardner

Lardner observed on page 124 of the fifth volume of his commentary:

At the time when Anastasius reigned in Constantinople he ruled that the Holy Gospels were not correct since their authors were not known so they were corrected a second time.

The above implies that up to the time of the above emperor the authenticity of the Gospels was doubted, otherwise he would not have ordered them to be corrected on the ground that their authors were not known. He believed them to be inspired books and therefore tried to remove the contradictions found in them. This also disproves the claim of the Protestants that no ruler or king of any time ever intruded into the affairs of the Church.

Observation No. 9

It has been pointed out earlier in this book that Augustine and other ancient Christians used to blame the Jews for distorting the Pentateuch in order to invalidate the Greek translation, because of their enmity towards the Christians. Hales and Kennicott also supported this view. Hales proved the authenticity of the Samaritan version with irrefutable arguments. Kennicott said that the Jews made deliberate alterations to the Pentateuch and opposed the view that the Samaritans changed it.

Observation No. 10

Kennicott proved the authenticity of the Samaritan translation and many scholars have said that his arguments are infallible and correct. They believe that the Jews changed it out of their enmity towards the Samaritans.

Observation No. 11

We have already pointed out earlier that Adam Clarke openly admitted that the historical books of the Old Testament had been changed in many places and that it would be useless to try to find any explanation for the changes.

Observation No. 12

We have shown earlier in this book that Adam Clarke adopted the view that the Jews changed the Hebrew and the Greek texts at chapter 64 verse 2 of the Book of Isaiah and that such distortions are also found at some other places.

Observation No. 13

As we have pointed out earlier Horne admitted that twelve verses in the books of the Old Testament were changed by the Jews.

Observation No. 14

We have shown earlier that the Catholic Church is unanimously agreed on the authenticity of the seven apocryphal books we listed. They also acknowledge the Latin translation as being inspired and genuine.

Protestant theologians, on the other hand, claim that those books have been distorted and should be rejected. They also claim that the Latin translation underwent innumerable alterations and additions from the fifth to the fifteenth century and that the copiers of this translation took great liberties with it. They inserted many sentences from

one book of the Old Testament into another and included the marginal notes in the main text of the book.

Observation No. 15

As has been already stated, Adam Clarke, following the example of Kennicott, adopted the opinion that in the time of Josephus the Jews intended to "enhance the beauty of the books by including spurious prayers, new episodes and songs". For example from the Book of Esther, the episode relating to wine, women and truth was added to the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, now known as the First Book of Ezra. The song of the three children was added to the Book of Daniel and there are many more examples.

These alterations, additions and other changes in the sacred books, made in the name of refinement, are enough to show that such changes were not objectionable to the Jews. They made as many changes as they liked as is clear in the light of the statement we quoted in observation No. 6 above which allowed them religiously to make changes in the sacred books for the cause of the truth.

Observation No. 16

We have already cited the statement of Adam Clarke with regard to the five books of the Pentateuch where he admitted that the majority of Christian scholars think that the Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch is the most correct of all the versions.

Observation No. 17

It has been already shown that the supplement which is found at the end of the book of Job of the Latin translation is false and spurious according to the Protestants, while, in fact, it was written before Christ, was a part of this translation in the time of the Apostles and was held to be genuine by the ancients.

Observation No. 18

We have already quoted the statement of Chrysostom witnessing that the Jews had lost or destroyed many books out of their dishonesty and carelessness and that some of them were destroyed and burnt by them. This view is upheld and acknowledged by the Catholics.

Observation No. 19

Horne said in the second volume of his commentary with regard to the Greek translation:

This translation is very old. It was considered authentic and was very popular among the ancient Christians. It was recited in the churches of both groups. The Christian elders, both Latins and Greeks, all copied from this version. Every subsequent translation acknowledged by the Christian Churches, save the Syrian version, has been prepared from this version. For example, the Arabic, the Armenian, the Ethiopian, and the old Italian and Latin translations, which were in vogue before Jerome. And this is the only translation which is taught up to this day in Greek and Eastern Churches.

Further he said:

According to our opinion, this was translated in 285 or 286 BC.

He also added:

It is an obvious argument, proving the great popularity of this translation, that the authors of the New Testament quoted many sentences from this it. The Christian elders of the past, with the exception of Jerome, had no knowledge of the Hebrew language. In copying the texts, they followed only the people who wrote the books with inspiration. Although they enjoyed the status of great renovators of Christianity they did not know Hebrew which is the basic source of all the sacred books. They put their trust in this translation and

acquired deep knowledge of it. The Greek church held it as a sacred book and had great esteem for it.

Again he said:

This translation continued to be recited in the Greek and Latin churches and was referred to for authenticity. It was also greatly trusted by the Jews and they recited it in their synagogues. Later, when the Christians started to derive their arguments against the Jews from this translation, the Jews commenced their criticism against it and said that it was not in accordance with the Hebrew version and that many verses from this translation had been removed at the beginning of the second century. They adopted Aquila's translation in its place. As this translation remained in vogue among the Jews up to the end of the first century and was equally used by the Christians, there were many copies of it. This translation too, was corrupted by the copiers and scribes by the inclusion of marginal notes and explanatory remarks in the main text. Ward, the great scholar of the Catholics, remarked in his book printed in 1841 (page 18): "The heretics of the East have distorted it."

The above statement of a great Protestant scholar is enough to confirm that the Jews deliberately changed the Pentateuch and that they distorted it out of their enmity towards the Christian faith, as is admitted by him in his statement. This leaves no room for denial. The same is admitted by Catholic scholars. This implies that both the Protestants and the Catholics have admitted the presence of deliberate distortions in the Pentateuch. Now, in the light of the above admission, we may be allowed to ask what there is to assure us that the Jews might have not changed the Hebrew version which was with them especially when it was not known to the Christian world.

When the above translation, which continued to be in vogue up to the fourth century and was recited in all the Eastern and Western churches, was so daringly changed without fear of censure from other people or punishment from God what was there to stop them from

changing the Hebrew version when they had nothing to fear? It makes no difference if this distortion was made by the Jews out of their animosity to the Christian faith, which is the view of Adam Clarke and Home, in spite of all his partiality, and which is also acknowledged by Augustine, or due to their enmity towards the Samaritans as was decided by Kennicott, or because of their antagonism towards each other. Deliberate manipulation also occurred at the hands of believing Christians simply out of opposition to other Christians who, in their opinion, were not correct. They did it only to spread the "truth". They had religious permission to modify the sacred texts for religious reasons.

The Witness of a Jewish Scholar Converted to Islam

A Jewish scholar embraced Islam in the period of Sultan Bayazid of Turkey.¹ He was given the Islamic name Abdu's-Salam. He wrote a booklet named *Risalatul-Hidayah* (The Book of Guidance) repudiating the Jews. In the third section of this book he said:

The most celebrated of all the commentaries on the Pentateuch (Torah) is the one known as the Talmud, which was written in the period of Ptolemy who reigned some time after the period of Nebuchadnezzar. This commentary contains the following story. It happened that once Ptolemy asked some Jewish scholars to bring the Pentateuch into his presence. The scholars were frightened, because the king disbelieved in some of its injunctions. Seventy scholars gathered together, and what they did was change those things that he did not believe in. Now when they admit to having done this, how can one trust a single verse of such a book?

In the presence of the statement of the Catholic scholar who said that the heretics of the East changed the translation which was in vogue in the churches of the East and the West and was followed by

1. Sultan Bayazid of Turkey, son of the famous caliph Mohammad, the conqueror (reigned from 1482 to 1512 AD).

the Catholic churches up to as late as 1500, as is pointed out by Home, the Catholics cannot save themselves from the accusation of the Protestants that they, the Catholics, have changed the Latin translation which was in vogue in their Church. Do the Catholics have any way to refute this claim?

Observation No. 20

The Rees Encyclopaedia, under the entry of 'Bible' in vol. 4, contains this statement:

Presenting the arguments in favour of those versions of the Old Testament that were written from 1000 to 1400, he said that all the versions written in the seventh and the eighth centuries had been destroyed by the order of the Jewish Council because they were contrary to their own versions. In view of this event Watson also said that the versions which were compiled six hundred years ago are not available and the versions written seven hundred or eight hundred years ago, do not exist at all.

This admission coming from Dr. Kennicott, the most trusted author in respect of the books of the Old Testament, should be noted. We are quite sure of the fact that the extirpation of the early versions under the orders of the Jewish Council must have happened two years after the appearance of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. This implies that even at the time of the appearance of the Holy Prophet their sacred books were in a condition, and the environment such, to allow distortions and alterations to be made in them. In fact it was always possible prior to the invention of the printing press. Even after the appearance of printing machines, they made alterations in the text of their books, for we have shown earlier in this chapter that Luther's translation was changed by his followers.¹

1. A comparison of Deuteronomy 33:2, in the Urdu version printed in 1958 with any other translation prior to it will sufficiently prove this claim.

Observation No. 21

Horsley said in his commentary (vol. 3, page 282) in his introduction to the book of Joshua:

It is quite definite and beyond all doubt that the sacred text has been distorted. It is evident from the incompatibilities found in various versions. Only one out of many contradicting statements can be true. It is almost certain that sometimes the worst kind of descriptions have been included in the printed text. I could not find any argument to support the claim that the distortions found in the single book of Joshua exceed the distortions found in all the books of the Old Testament.

He also said on page 275 of the same volume:

It is absolutely true that the copies of the Hebrew version possessed by the people after the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar, or even a little before it, were more defective than the ones that appeared after the correction of Ezra.

Observation No. 22

Watson said on page 283 of volume 3 of his book:

Origen complained about these differences and tried to attribute them to various causes like the negligence of the copiers, and the carelessness and ill-intention of the scribes.

Observation No. 23

Adam Clarke, in the introduction to the first volume of his commentary, said:

There were innumerable versions of the Latin translation before Jerome some of which contained serious distortions and had passages alarmingly contradictory with each other, as Jerome had been proclaiming.

Observation No. 24

Ward admitted on pages 17 and 18 of his book printed in 1841:

Dr. Humphrey has pointed out on page 178 of his book that the whims of the Jews have so much distorted the books of the Old Testament that it is easily noticed by readers. He added that the predictions concerning Christ were totally eliminated by the Jews.

Observation No. 25

Philip Guadagnolo, a priest, wrote a book named *Khaylat* in refutation of the book written by Ahmad Sharif son of Zain'ul-'Abidin Isfahani printed in 1649. He observed in part 6:

Great distortion is found in the Chaldean version, particularly in the book of Solomon Rabbi Aquila, known as Onqelos, who copied the whole of the Pentateuch. Similarly the Rabbi son of Uziel copied the Book of Joshua, the Book of Judges, the Books of Kings, the Book of Isaiah and those of other Prophets. And Rabbi Joseph, the blind, copied the Psalms and the Books of Job, Ruth, Esther and Solomon. All these copiers distorted the text of these books. We Christians preserved them, so that the blame for distortion must be laid at the door of the Jews, though we do not believe those false descriptions.

Observation No. 26

Horne said on page 68 of volume 1 of his book:

We must acknowledge that there are verses present in the Pentateuch which are later additions.

Further on page 445 of volume 2 he observed:

There is a lesser number of distorted places in the Hebrew version.

This number is nine as we have already pointed out.

Observation No. 27

A petition was submitted to King James I complaining that the Psalms included in the book of prayer were incompatible with those found in the Hebrew version. They are different from the Hebrew version in having additions, omissions and alterations in not less than two hundred places.

Observation No. 28

Carlyle remarked:

The English translators have distorted the sense, obscured the truth, misguided the ignorant and confused the simple text of the books. They prefer darkness to light and falsehood to the truth.

Observation No. 29

Broughton, one of the members of the Church council, suggested that there should be a new translation. According to him, the current translation was full of errors. He declared before the Church that the famous English translator had distorted the text in as many as eight thousand four hundred and eighty places, that he was responsible for making people convert to other faiths, and that he deserved eternal punishment in the fires of Hell.

Observations nos. 27, 28 and 29 have been borrowed from Ward's book which contains many more such statements.

Observation No. 30: Horne's View of Biblical Distortion

Horne explained causes for the presence of the various readings found in the books of the Bible in chapter eight of volume 2 of his book. He said that there are basically four causes of distortion which are as follows:

The First Cause:

As a result of the copier's mistake or oversight which includes the following possibilities:

- (1) The copier wrote by dictation and at places where he could not understand it properly neglectfully recorded it according to his own understanding.
- (2) The similarity of the Hebrew and Greek letters confused the copier and he wrote the one in place of the other.
- (3) The copier might have mistaken the signs written above the letters for the letters themselves and included them in the text or misunderstood the text and wrongly made corrections in it.
- (4) In the process of writing, the copier realised his error quite late in the process. He did not wish to cancel what he had written and now included what had been omitted without changing what he had already written.
- (5) The copier forgot to write something and then, realising what had happened, he included what he had omitted earlier, shifting the passage from one place to another.
- (6) The copier overlooked the line he was writing and wrote the next line in its place thus omitting a portion from the text.
- (7) The copier misunderstood an abbreviation and elucidated it according to his own understanding.
- (8) The main cause of the presence of various readings is the ignorance and carelessness of the copiers who also inserted the marginal notes into the main text through their ignorance.

The Second Cause:

The second cause of the variation in readings was the shortcomings and deficiencies of the original copy from which the copier prepared a new copy. This too, might have occurred in many forms. For instance, the signs of the letters might not have been completely legible and could not therefore be recorded or the letters of one page might have soaked through the page and become imprinted on another page and then have been taken as part of that page. Sometimes an omitted sentence was written in the margin without any sign and the

copier, not knowing where to write it, included it in a wrong place making the text inconsistent.

The Third Cause:

The third cause of various readings of the texts is the correction of certain words based on the assumptions of the copier. This also might have happened in many ways. Sometimes the copier misunderstood the correct text as being defective or grammatically incorrect while it was not wrong being rather the mistake of the author himself. Sometimes the copier not only corrected the text grammatically but also refined its language or omitted words that he thought were not needed or excluded one or more synonyms that, in his opinion, had no distinct meanings to convey.

The most frequent occurrence is of additions in the text caused by mixing the text with the sentences written against them in the margin. This kind of distortion is particularly noted in case of the Gospels and also accounts for the abundance of additions found in the epistles of Paul, so that the passages he borrowed from the Old Testament might accord with the Latin translation. Some people amended the whole New Testament to correspond with the Latin translation.

The Fourth Cause:

Self-indulgence and egotism have been a main cause of these deliberate distortions, no matter whether the one responsible for them belonged to the faithful or to the heretics. No one has been so much reproached and disapproved as Marcion among the past heretics. It has also been confirmed that some deliberate changes in the text were made by those belonging to the faithful. Later on, these alterations were accepted as preferable either because they supported some commonly believed conception or because they helped remove some objection.

Horne provided many specific examples of all the above four causes which we leave to avoid prolongation. Some examples of the distortions made by the faithful, however, will be of interest and we

include some of them here.

- (1) Luke chapter 22 verse 43¹ was deliberately omitted, as the faithful thought it to be against Christ's divinity to be strengthened by an angel.
- (2) The words "before they came together" have been omitted from Matthew 1:18,² and the words, "her first born son"³ have been excluded from chapter 1 verse 25 of the same Gospel, in order to remove any possible doubt about the Virginity of Mary.
- (3) The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, chapter 15 verse 5 contained the word 'twelve'⁴ which was changed to 'eleven' to free Paul from the accusation of having made a false statement, as Judas Iscariot had died before it.
- (4) Some words have been omitted from the Gospel of Mark chapter 13 verse 32.⁵ Some priests also rejected them as they thought they supported Arian thought.
- (5) Some words have been added to Luke 1:35 in its Syrian, Greek and Ethiopian translations.⁶ Words have also been added in the copies of many priests in order to refute the Eutychian sect who denied the deistic nature of Christ.

In short, Horne specified the presence of all the possible forms of distortions in the texts of the sacred books. The above specific exam-

1. This verse contains the event of Christ's visit to the Mount of Olives the night before his crucifixion where he is described as having been strengthened by angel.
2. This verse contains: "As his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." (Matt. 1:18)
3. "And knew her not till she had brought forth her first born son." (Matt. 1:25). These words still exist in the King James Version.
4. This has been discussed in detail under the error No. 97. The word twelve still exists in the King James version.
5. It contains, "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the son, but the father." (Mark, 13:32). This verse refutes the doctrine of trinity which was also rejected by the Arians.
6. It contains, "And the angel answered and said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that Holy thing that will be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." (Luke 1:35.). As this verse also speaks against the doctrine of trinity, it might have been changed for this reason.

ples prove the fact that the texts of the biblical books have been changed through additions, omissions and deliberate alterations by the faithful as well as by heretics. Similarly we may not be wrong if we claim that Christians, who were deeply committed to the trinity and not willing to ignore it for their interests, might have changed some passages after the appearance of Islam simply because they were in accordance with Islamic teachings as they had done before against different sects of Christianity.

Second Contention

The Witness of Christ and his Apostles

Another subterfuge frequently employed by the Christians in their attempt to uphold their claim of unsullied Divine Revelation for the Bible is their claim that Christ testified to the truth of the books of the Old Testament and, if they had truly been distorted by the Jews, Christ would have blamed them for it.

The First Answer

As an answer to this misconception we may be allowed first to point out that the authenticity of the Old and the New Testament has never been proved through a constant chain of reliable reporters, a fact which we discussed earlier in this book in sufficient detail. Therefore all these books, in our opinion, are dubious and uncertain and thus any quotation from these books is not acceptable unless it can be proved through undeniable sources that a particular statement really was made by Christ because it is always possible that the verse in question may be a later addition added by the 'faithful' at the end of the second century or in the third century in order to refute the Ebionites, Marcionites or the Manichaeans. Or these additions might have been included later on because they supported some commonly held belief. These sects had rejected all, or at least most, of the books of the Old Testament as we showed when mentioning the Marcionites earlier. Bell stated in his history with regard to the belief of the

Marcionites:

This sect believed in the existence of two gods, one, the creator of good, and the other, the creator of evil. They believed that the books of the Old Testament were given by the God of evil. They all disbelieve the New Testament.

Lardner said in this regard on page 486 of vol. 8 of his commentary:

This sect claims that the God of the Jews is not the father of Jesus, and that Jesus was sent to abolish the law of Moses, since it was against the Evangel.

He also said in vol. 3 of his commentary with regard to the Manichaeans :

The historians are in complete agreement that the Manichaeans never believed in the books of the Old Testament. It is written in the Acts of Archelaus that it was their belief that Satan deceived the Prophets of the Jews. It was Satan that spoke with them in the name of God. They derived their argument for this belief from John, 10:8 where Christ says, "All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers."

The Second Answer:

Even if we put aside the question of its being an addition, the claim does not prove the truth of all the books, because the statement does not specify the number and names of the books of the Old Testament. In this case there is no way to ascertain that the books which were in vogue among the Jews were thirty-nine in number, as is acknowledged by the Protestants of our time or forty-six as is acknowledged by the Catholics and in any case these books include the Book of Daniel which was not acknowledged as authentic by the Jews contemporary with Christ. They do not even accept Daniel as a Prophet, except Josephus, the historian, who said in his book:

We do not have thousands of books containing contradictory material, we have only twenty-two which talk of past

events and are considered by us as inspiration. The first five of these are the books of Moses which describe the events from the beginning of the creation to the death of Moses and there are thirteen other books that were written by other Prophets, describing the period after the death of Moses to the time of Ardashir. The remaining four books consist of prayers and eulogies.

The above witness does not in any way prove the truth of the current books. According to Josephus the total number of books is seventeen excluding the five books of the Pentateuch, while according to the Protestants there are thirty-four books and the Catholics believe that there are forty-one books other than the Pentateuch. No one knows which of the books were included in the seventeen books, because this historian ascribed two more books to Ezekiel other than his famous book. It seems quite logical to believe that these two books, which are now extinct, were included in the seventeen books in his time.

Apart from this, it has been already shown that Chrysostom and other Catholic scholars admitted that the Jews had destroyed many sacred books, some being torn up and others burnt, out of their perversion. The books of the Old Testament that we are going to enumerate are the part of the Old Testament which cannot be denied by any of the Catholic and the Protestant scholars in view of the arguments that follow. It is therefore possible that some of these books might have been included in the seventeen books referred to by Josephus.

The Missing Books of the Old Testament

The following books, which we find mentioned in the books of the present Old Testament, have disappeared from it:

(1) The Book of the Wars of the Lord:

This book is mentioned in Numbers 21:14 and has been discussed by us earlier in this book. Henry and Scott's commentary has this statement:

Presumably this book was written by Moses for the guidance of Joshua and described the demarcation of the land of Moab.¹

(2) The Book of Jasher:

This book is mentioned in Joshua 10:13. We have discussed it earlier. It is also mentioned in II Samuel, 1:18.

(3-5) There were three books of the Prophet Solomon, the first contained one thousand and five Psalms, the second described the history of the creation, and the third consisted of three thousand Proverbs. We find this last book mentioned in I Kings,² Some of these Proverbs are still in existence. Adam Clarke under his comments on I Kings 4:32 said:

The Proverbs currently attributed to Solomon, are nine hundred or nine hundred and twenty-three, and if we accept the claim of some scholars that the first nine chapters of the book are not from Solomon the number is reduced to only about six hundred and fifty. Psalm 127 in which the name of Solomon appears is not from Solomon, it being rightly claimed by some scholars that it was written by the Prophet David for the guidance of his son, Solomon.

He further said with regard to the history of creation:

Scholars are very much aggrieved at the disappearance of the history of the world's creation.

(6) The Book of the Manner of the Kingdom:

This was written by Samuel as mentioned in I Samuel 10:25:

Then Samuel told the People the manner of the Kingdom, and wrote it in a book and laid it up before the Lord.

(7) The History of Samuel the Seer.

1. This land was to the East of the Dead Sea.

2. "And he spoke three thousand Proverbs." I Kings 4:32

(8) The History of the Prophet Nathan

(9) The Book of Gad the Seer

All the above three books are mentioned in I Chronicles.¹ Adam Clarke remarked on page 1522 of Vol. 2 of his book that these books were extinct.

(10) The Book of Shemaiah, the Prophet

(11) The Book of Iddo, the Seer:

Both the above books are mentioned in II Chronicles 12:15.²

(12) The Prophecy of Ahijah.

(13) The Visions of Iddo the Seer

These two books are mentioned in II Chronicles 9:29.³ The book of Nathan and Iddo are also mentioned in this verse. Adam Clarke said on page 1539 of vol. 2 of his book:

All these books have become non-existent.

(14) The Book of Jehu the son of Hanani

This is mentioned in II Chronicles 20:34.⁴ Adam Clarke said on page 561 of vol. 2 of his book:

This book has been completely lost, though it existed in the time of compilation of the Second Book of Kings.

(15) The Book of Isaiah the Prophet

This book consisted of complete accounts of Uzziah. It is men-

1. "They are written in the book of Samuel the Seer, and in the book of Nathan the Prophet, and in the book of Gad the Seer." I Chronicles 29:29.

2. "Now the acts of Rehoboam, first and last, are they not written in the book of Shemaiah the prophet, and of Iddo the seer."

3. "The acts of Solomon, first and last, are they not written in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and in the visions of Iddo the Seer." (II Chr. 9:29)

4. "Now the rest of the acts of Jehoshaphat, first and last, behold, they are written in the book of Jehu the son of Hanani, who is mentioned in the book of the Kings of Israel." This also implies that the book of Jehu was included in the book of Kings.

tioned in II Chronicles 26:22.¹

(16) The Book of Visions of Isaiah:

This contained complete accounts of Hezekiah and is mentioned in II Chronicles 32:32.²

(17) The Lamentation of Jeremiah:

This consisted of Jeremiah's lamentation for Josiah that is described in II Chronicles 35:25.³

(18) The Book of Chronicles:

This is mentioned in Nehemiah 12:23.⁴ Adam Clarke said on page 1676 of volume 2 of his book:

This book is not included in the present books. This is another book which does not exist today.

(19) The Book of Covenant of Moses:

We find it mentioned in Exodus 24:7.⁵

(20) The Book of the Acts of Solomon:

The mention of this book appears in I Kings, 11:14.

We already know that Josephus ascribed two more books to Ezekiel in addition to his famous book. Josephus is a trusted name among the Christians. This takes the total number of the missing books to twenty-two. The Protestants have no way of refuting the existence of these books. Thomas Inglis said in his book in Urdu enti-

1. "The rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah the Prophet, the son of Amoz, write."

2. "The rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and his goodness, behold, they are written in the vision of Isaiah the Prophet."

3. "And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah behold they are written in the Lamentations."

4. "The son of Levi, the chief of the fathers were written in the book of Chronicles."

5. "And he took the book of covenant and read in the audience."

tioned, *Mira'atus Sidk* (The Mirror of the Truth) printed in 1856:

There is unanimous agreement on the fact that the number of the books that have been lost or have disappeared from the sacred books is not less than twenty.¹

The Third Answer

As a third answer to the false Christian claim regarding the witness of Christ and his Apostles for the truth of the sacred books, we may point out that; even if we acknowledge the presence of the current books during the lifetime of Christ and that Christ did indeed witness to the truth of these books, this only confirms the existence of these books at that time, without confirming the truth of their attribution to their authors and without verifying the truth of each and every passage contained by them. Even if Christ and his Apostles did report something from these books it would not necessarily signify their absolute truth. However, in the case of Jesus, it would clearly have shown that a particular injunction of those books was from God, given that his statement could be proved to be really his through an unbroken chain of reporters. This is not a contention posited only by the Muslims, for the Protestants also have adopted this opinion. Paley, the great scholar of the Protestants observed in chapter 3 of his book printed in London in 1850:

There is no doubt that our Saviour confirmed that the Pentateuch was the Book of God. It is improbable that its origin and existence could be without God. Especially because the Jews, who were expert in religious matters and beginners in other matters like war and peace, did firmly adhere to monotheism. Their concept of God and His attributes is

1. We may be allowed to add here that a number of prophecies recorded by the evangelists have been mentioned in Islamic literature and are not found in the present books. It is fair to assume that they might have been in some of the missing books listed above. It is not certain that the five books of Moses described by Josephus were the same books as the present Pentateuch. There are indications that they were not in fact the same.

remarkable compared to other peoples who were committed to innumerable Gods. It is also certain that our Saviour acknowledged the prophethood of the most of the copiers of the Old Testament. It is the duty of all us Christians to observe these limits.

The claim that each and every verse of the Old Testament is true and inspired, and that there is no need for investigation of their authors, invites unnecessary difficulties and trouble. These books were commonly read by the Jews of the time of our Saviour. They were believed in and acted upon by them, and the Apostles used to turn to them for guidance. This attitude of the Jews allows us to reach only one conclusion that the truth and divinity of a prophetic statement is confirmed only when Christ specifically witnessed to its being from God. Otherwise it only proves that these books were commonly acknowledged in that period.

In this case our sacred books would be the best witness for the Jewish Scriptures. It is, however, necessary to understand the nature of this witness. Its nature is different from what I have sometimes described. Every incident has a particular common cause and nature which provides strength for its proof, even if it apparently looks to be different but, in fact, comes out to be the same when all aspects are closely viewed. For example James said in his epistle:¹

Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord.

We know that the truth of the book of Job has been a matter of great controversy among Christian scholars. This witness of James confirms only the fact that this book was present and acknowledged by the Jews. Similarly Paul said in his second epistle to Timothy:²

Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so these also resist the truth.

1. James 5:11.

2. II Tim. 3:8.

These two names are not found in the Old Testament and we do not know if Paul reported them from one of the apocryphal books or knew of them through tradition. Had this event been written Paul would have reported it from the text and would have not made himself the pivot of the truth of this event, to the extent that the truth of his letter became dependent on the question of whether Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses or not.

The object of my contention is not to show that there is no testimony superior to that of Jannes and Jambres or Job regarding the history of the Jews. I see this matter from another perspective. What I mean is, that a particular verse of the Old Testament being recorded by the evangelists does not prove it to be so true as to distrust the arguments coming from external sources. It is not correct to take it as a principle that every word of Jewish history is true. This would make all their books unreliable. I must stress this point because Walter and his disciples used to take shelter in the Jewish writings and then raised objections against Christianity. Some of their objections are based on the fact that they misinterpreted the meanings of the texts, while some of their objections are simply founded on exaggeration. But the main cause of their objections is the misconception that any witness of Christ and the ancient teachers confirming the prophethood of Moses and other Prophets is a witness to the truth of each and every verse of the Old Testament, and that it is obligatory for the Christians to support everything written in the Old Testament.

Varied Opinions on the Truth of Some Books of the Bible

The Book of Job

The above statement clearly confirms our previous claims. Paley's remark that there is great controversy among the Christian scholars with regard to the authenticity of the book of Job, is, in fact, a reference to a great dispute among the scholars in this regard. Jewish scholars such as Semler, Michaelis, Leclerc and Stock said Job was a pseudonym and that such a man never really existed and that his book

is nothing but a collection of false and unreal stories. On the other hand Calmet and Vantil claimed that Job was a real person who lived at that time.

Those who recognise him as a real person place him in various historical periods. There are seven different opinions:

- (1) Some scholars claim that he was a contemporary of the Prophet Moses.
- (2) Some others put him in the period of Judges¹ after the death of Joshua.
- (3) Some People argue that he lived in the time of Ahasuerus or Ardashir, the Kings of Persia.
- (4) Another opinion puts him in the period prior to the visit of Abraham to Canaan.
- (5) Some hold him to have lived at the time of Jacob.
- (6) Others claim him to have been a contemporary of Solomon.
- (7) Some scholars said that he lived in the time of King Nebuchadnezzar.

Horne said that all these opinions showed weakness.

Similarly there are differing opinions concerning Job's place of birth, "Ghota".² There are three opinions, with regard to the geographical location of this place. Burckhardt, Spanheim, Calmet and others believe that it was a place in the Arabian peninsula. Michaelis and Ilgen³ place it near Damascus. Lowth, Magee, Hales and Chodac said "Ghota" was the second name of Adom.

The same differences exist with regard to the author. There are varied opinions about him. He was a Jew; he was Job; he was Solomon; he was Isaiah; or he was an unknown person who was a contemporary of King Mansar. According to some ancient writers the book was written by Moses in the Hebrew language. Origen claims that it

1. The period of Judges.

2. The word appears in the early Arabic Version as 'Ghota', while in the New Arabic version it is 'Aus' while in the Urdu Version it is 'Uz' (which is in accordance with the King James Version.)

3. Ilgen, a famous scholar of the eighteenth century.

was translated from Syrian to Greek. Similar disagreement is found about the last portion of the book. We discussed this earlier.

All this is sufficient proof that their claim for the authenticity of their books is not based on reports from authentic sources. They can nowhere show a sequence of reporters going back to the author of even a single verse of their books. Most of their claims are founded simply on surmises and false deductions. Theodore, the fifth century priest, condemned this book. Ward, on the other hand, reported the following remark of Luther, the founding leader of the Protestant faith who said:

This book is merely a fable.

In view of the above statements this book cannot be considered as inspired.

The Book of Esther

We have shown that the book of Esther remained rejected and disapproved of until the year 354. Even the name of its author is not definitely known. Melito and Athanasius also disapproved of it, while Amphilochius expressed suspicions about its authenticity.

The Song of Solomon

The condition of the Song of Solomon is no different to that of the Book of Job. Theodore, the priest, equally condemned and rejected this book while Simon and Leclerc have denied its authenticity. Wettstein and other later writers said that it was a vile song and should therefore be discarded from the sacred books. Semler said that there is a definite indication that this book is a fiction. Ward quoted Castello suggesting that its exclusion from the sacred books is necessary.

If the witness of Christ and his Apostles implied proof of the authenticity of each and every part of the Old Testament, the above serious differences would not have existed among ancient and modern writers. In view of the above, Paley's statement produced above is the

most factual and final. Besides, we have already pointed out that Judaeo-Christian scholars are agreed on the fact that Ezra made mistakes in the First Book of Chronicles, and this book, too, is one of those for which Christ, in their opinion, gave witness. So even if they reject the findings of Paley what can they say about these mistakes of Ezra?

The Fourth Answer

If we assume for a moment that the testimony of Christ and his Apostles was enough to prove the authenticity of each and every part of these books, it does not make any difference for, as we have already proved, these books were changed and distorted after the time of the Christ and his Apostles. Among the ancient Christians, Justin, Augustine and Chrysostom held the same opinion and all the Catholic and the Protestant scholars like Sylbergius, Grabe, Whitaker, Leclerc and Watson clearly admitted that these books were changed by the Jews after the time of the Apostles. All this has been sufficiently proved in earlier pages of this book. The question is whether the distorted versions of these texts, to which they admitted, were present at the time of Christ and his Apostles or not? The fact is that their authenticity in both cases remains unproved and doubtful and this is what we claim to have demonstrated.

As for their argument that Christ would have accused the Jews for inserting distortions in the texts had they been involved in it, we must remind them that the ancient Christians, themselves, used to change the texts of the sacred books, and we may add that many of the present distortions were made in their own period and the Apostles used to blame them in vain for it. Apart from this historical evidence, it was not, at all, necessary for Christ to accuse them, as we have seen earlier that Christ and his Apostles blamed neither Samaritans nor the Jews for making distortions in their versions. What we mean to say is, that the Hebrew and Samaritan versions are so seriously different from each other that one of them must be distorted. Had it been necessary for Christ to distribute blame, he must have blamed one or the

other of the two groups. This difference between the two versions has been a point of controversy among the groups of scholars. Dr. Kennicott and his followers favour the Samaritans while most Protestants support the Jews.

We do not find any evidence that Christ or his Apostles have ever cast blame on either group. Christ did not say anything in this regard even when a Samaritan woman asked a question specifically about this matter. He remained silent on this occasion. His silence provides support, if not proof, for the Samaritan version. Dr. Kennicott based his argument on Christ's silence and favoured the Samaritan version.

Third Contention

It is often contended that the Jews and the Christians were as truthful and honest as the Muslims claim to be. Being honest they cannot be accused of having distorted their text. The imbecility of this contention must be quite evident to the readers in the presence of what they have so far read in earlier pages, with regard to admissions made by ancient and modern writers to the effect that the sacred books have certainly been changed. Especially when they are religiously allowed to alter and change certain passages in the name of propagating the truth.

Fourth Contention

In order to remove the blame of distortion from their books they often claim that "the copies and versions of the sacred books were so much circulated in both the East and the West that it was as impossible to change them." This contention also is as laughable as the third one. Because, in the presence of unambiguous admissions of distortions by the Judaeo-Christian scholars, this contention is of no help to them.

The Judaeo-Christian books can never be compared to the Holy Qur'an as far as their history and authenticity is concerned. This is because the biblical books were in such a state before the invention of

printing that they could easily be tampered with. Their popularity was not to the extent that could prevent distortion. We have already seen how the heretics of the East and the Jews manipulated the text of the Latin translation which was the best known in both the East and the West. Admissions of both Catholics and Protestants to this effect have already been cited. On the other hand, the Holy Qur'an, right from the time of its revelation, has been known to, and acted upon by, thousands of people in every age. In addition to its preservation in book form it has been kept preserved in the hearts of thousands of people throughout the ages.

The Holy Qur'an was not, even for a single day, in a state that any change in it would physically have been possible. The preservation of the whole of the Holy Qur'an by memorising it is still practised throughout the Islamic world. There are always thousands of people present in Qur'anic schools who have memorised all of the Holy Qur'an along with its complete intonations as practiced by the Holy Prophet himself. Any one can verify this fact for himself. For example, there are one thousand '*Huffaz*'¹ present in the university of al-Azhar in Cairo alone. There is no village and town in Egypt where *Huffaz* are not found.

There is, however, no tradition of memorising the sacred books in the Judaeo-Christian world. There are only rare examples of this practice. The Christian population of the world is larger than the Muslim population and they are financially in a better position but in spite of this we have never heard of any *hafiz* of the Old or the New Testament. There is only the Prophet Ezra who was supposed to have memorised the Pentateuch. It is the miracle of the Holy Qur'an that even today there are many hundred thousand people who treasure the Holy Qur'an in their hearts. This ever-living miracle of the Holy Qur'an can be seen any where in the Islamic world.

1. *Huffaz*, sing. *Hafiz*, someone who has memorised the Holy Qur'an completely with all its intonations. Such people conduct the prayer of *Tarawih* in the month of Ramadan and recite the whole of the Holy Qur'an by heart in the 29 days of the month. There are at present more than a hundred thousand *Huffaz* in the sub continent of India and Pakistan alone.

As proof of this there is an account of an English officer who visited a Qur'anic School in Saharanpur in India and saw the children busy learning the Holy Qur'an by heart. The officer asked the teacher what book it was. Discovering that it was the Holy Qur'an, he asked how many of those children had memorised the Holy Qur'an completely. The teacher pointed to a few of them. The officer asked one of them to come forward and held the Holy Qur'an himself and asked him to recite from various places. The student recited the portions exactly as was written with all its intonations. He was very astonished at this and remarked that he was witness to the fact that no other book of the world could claim the status of being as original and authentic as the Holy Qur'an for a child of twelve or thirteen years of age was able to write it down without making a mistake.

Historicity of the Bible

History has recorded a vast quantity of indisputable evidence to show that none of the original revelations except the Holy Qur'an have not been able to save themselves from the cruel hands of political turmoil. We would like to produce some historical evidence to prove this claim:

First Evidence:

The Prophet Moses handed over the Torah (the Pentateuch) to the scholars and chiefs of the Israelites during his lifetime and commanded them to keep it safe in the Ark of the Covenant.¹ It used to be taken out of the ark every seven years at the time of the Passover. The Torah was kept safe in the ark for some time and the people acted upon it in the first century after Moses, but subsequently they changed its injunctions. Committing apostasy and subsequently returning to Judaism was their usual practice.² This state of affairs remained

1. This was a sacred box of the Israelites which was made under the command of God as described in Torah. The Holy Qur'an also mentions it as *Tabut*. It has a long history. Curious readers may refer to Joshua chapters 3,6,11,14 and 15; I Samuel 4:11 and chapter 6; and II Samuel chapters 6,15 and 24 to 29.

2. See the book of Judges which is full of accounts of their disobedience.

unchanged up to the reign of the Prophet David. In his time there was some improvement in their attitude which lasted up to the beginning of Solomon's period.¹ During the subsequent historical calamities and great turmoil the Pentateuch was lost. The time of its disappearance is not known with certainty. When the Prophet Solomon opened the ark, he found only two stone tablets in it. These two tablets of stone contained only the Ten Commandments. This is described in I Kings 8:2:

There was nothing in the ark save the two tablets of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the lord made a covenant with the children of Israel when they came out of the land of Egypt.

Then towards the end of the reign of Solomon, there started a sequence of great changes which are confirmed by the sacred books and after his death even greater turmoil took place. The Children of Israel were separated and divided. Now there existed two separate kingdoms. Jeroboam became the king of ten tribes and his domain was named the Kingdom of Israel, while Rehoboam the son of Solomon became the king of two tribes, his land was named the Kingdom of Judah. Jeroboam, just after his ascension to the throne, became an apostate and turned to idol worship, with the result that all his people took to idol worship.

Those who still followed the law of the Pentateuch had to migrate to the kingdom of Judah. In this way all these tribes continued to be infidels and idol worshippers for two hundred and fifty years. Then there came punishment from God through the invasion of the king of Assyria,² who imprisoned them and then deported them to various countries. Only a small group of people were left who later on established social relations with the Assyrians and started marrying them.³

The new generation born as a result of these mixed relations came to be known as Samaritans. In short, right from the time of Jeroboam up to the end of the Kingdom of Israel, these people had no contact

1. See II Samuel and I Kings.
2. II Kings 17:3-23.
3. II Kings 17:41.

with the Pentateuch and its injunctions. For all those years the existence of the Torah was not known to them.

Nor was the condition of the Kingdom of Judah very different from that of the Kingdom of Israel. They had twenty kings in three hundred and seventy two years. The number of apostate kings was more than those who were believers. Idol worship had become a common practice in the period of Rehoboam. Idols were placed under every tree in order to be worshipped. Then, in the reign of Ahaz, idol worship became the practice of the ruler himself and he, "shut up the doors of the House of the Lord and he made altars in every corner of Jerusalem."¹

Prior to this the House of the Lord had been destroyed and ruined twice. First the king of Egypt captured it and plundered the women of the House of the Lord as well as the royal ladies. The second time was when the apostate king of Israel raided it and did the same with the women of the House of the Lord and the ladies of the royal palaces. Infidelity and idolatry reached its climax in the reign of Manasseh when the majority of the people converted to idolatry. He built altars for the idols right in the courtyard of the temple and the king even shifted the particular deity that he worshipped to the temple precincts.² Circumstances remained unchanged in the reign of Amon the son of Manasseh.³ However, when Josiah the son of Amon ascended to the throne, he sincerely repented and turned to God with the result that his officials started reviving the law of Moses and tried to obliterate all traces of idolatry and infidelity. There was no trace of existence of the Pentateuch for as long as seventeen years after his ascension to the throne.⁴

Discovery of the Pentateuch in the Reign of Josiah

It was in the eighteenth year of Josiah's accession⁵ that the high

1. II Chronicles 28:24.
2. II Kings 21:2-7.
3. II Kings 21:20.
4. II Kings 22:2.
5. II Kings 22:3.

priest Hilkiah suddenly claimed that he had found a copy of the Pentateuch in the temple. He handed it down to the scribe Shaphan. This copy was read to King Josiah. Josiah having discovered the contents of the book, was very shocked and aggrieved concerning the opposite practice of the Israelites for all those years and rent his clothes. We find this mentioned in II Kings chapter 22, and Chronicles chapter 34. The statement of Hilkiah is not acceptable, nor is the copy discovered by him in any way reliable for reasons that we will discuss below.

We know from history that the temple of the Lord had been totally destroyed twice prior to the reign of Ahaz. Subsequently it was turned into a place of idol worship. The keepers and worshippers used to enter the temple frequently. It seems inconceivable that a copy of the Pentateuch, which was present in the temple all that time, could have remained unnoticed by the people for as long a period as seventeen years. Especially when all the officials of Josiah's Kingdom were striving hard to bring about the revival of the law of Moses, and the priests were continually in the House of the Lord, going through every inch of it.

The truth is that this copy was invented by Hilkiah himself. When he saw that king Josiah and all the people were inclined to the law of Moses and were trying to revive it, he started writing down the verbal tradition that he came to hear and remembered or was conveyed to him by others, with little regard for its reality and authenticity. It took him seventeen years to complete it. Then after its completion he found an opportunity to attribute it to Moses. And it is not surprising that that this was done for the sake of truth because, as we know, this kind of falsehood was allowed, indeed encouraged, by their faith as we have discussed earlier.

From Josiah to Nebuchadnezzar

Even if we ignore what we have just said and accept that the copy of the Pentateuch found by Hilkiah in the eighteenth year of Josiah's ascension was original, it takes us nowhere. This copy of the Pentateuch was followed and acted upon for only thirteen years. After the

death of Josiah, his son Jehoahaz ascended to throne and he also deviated from the law of the Pentateuch and became an apostate. Infidelity came back to rule again. The king of Egypt then conquered the land of Judah and imprisoned Jehoahaz. The throne was given to his brother. He too was an apostate. His son took over as king after his death. He also, like his father and uncle, was an apostate. Nebuchadnezzar invaded Jerusalem and captured him and his people. The temple and royal treasury were plundered by him. The nephew of the king was entrusted with the kingdom and he also was an apostate.

In the light of the above, one is naturally drawn to conclude that the original Pentateuch was lost before the period of Josiah. The copy that was discovered by Hilkiah in his reign was not reliable and authenticated and, in any case, remained in vogue for only thirteen years. We do not find any sign of its continued existence. Apparently apostasy and infidelity found its way into their lives after the death of Jehoahaz and the Pentateuch had ceased to exist prior to the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar. Taking it granted that some rare copies of the Pentateuch still existed, the calamitous invasion of Nebuchadnezzar eliminated all possibilities of its existence.

The Second Evidence

The king,¹ who was entrusted with the rule of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar, rebelled against him. Nebuchadnezzar invaded Jerusalem a second time, imprisoned the king, slaughtered his children before his eyes which were gouged out.² And in the words of Chronicles he:

...had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man or him that stooped for age: he gave them all into his hand. And all the vessels of the house of God, great and small, and the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king and of his princes; all these he brought to Babylon.³

1. King Zedekiah. II Chr.36.

2. This description is found in II Chron. 36:17-21, but there is no mention of the gouging out of his eyes in the King James version.

3. II Chron. 36:18,19.

During this calamity the Pentateuch and all the books written before it were absolutely destroyed. This is also admitted by the scholars of the Christian world as has been shown earlier in this book.

The Third Evidence

When the prophet 'Ezra' recompiled the books of the Old Testament, as is claimed by the Christians, they were subjected to another disaster at the hands of Antiochus, a king from Europe who, after conquering Jerusalem, burnt and tore up all the available copies of the books of the Old Testament. The following is from I Maccabees chapter 1:

Never a copy of the Divine law but was torn up and burned; if any were found that kept the sacred record or obeyed the Lord's will, his life was forfeit to the king's edict. Month by month such deeds of violence were done.¹

This calamity befell them one hundred and sixty-one years before the birth of Christ and lasted for a period of three and a half years. These events were described by Josephus and historians of the Christian world. All the copies of the Old Testament written by Ezra were absolutely destroyed as we discussed at the beginning of this book. The following remarks are quoted from the Catholic, John Mill:

When the correct copies of these books appeared through Ezra, these too were lost during the invasion of Antiochus.

John Mill further remarked:

In this case the these books cannot be considered authentic without the witness of Christ and his apostles to them.

We may remind the readers that we have sufficiently explained the situation regarding the witness of Christ and of his apostles.

1. Maccabees 1:59-61.

The Fourth Evidence

After this persecution by Antiochus, the Jews were subjected to many more historical calamities at the hands of other kings who destroyed whatever was left of the writings of Ezra. One famous event is the invasion of the Roman emperor, Titus. This was a painful event of Jewish history and happened thirty-seven years after the ascension of Christ. In this incident hundreds of thousands of Jews were killed by sword, fire or hunger. Josephus described this event in great detail. Ninety-seven thousand Jews were enslaved and sold in other countries.

The Fifth Evidence

The ancient Christians, from the very beginning, were not very much inclined towards the Hebrew version of the Old Testament. The majority of them believed it to have been distorted by the Jews. They trusted and acknowledged the Greek version, especially up to the end of the second century. The same version was also followed by the Jews up to the end of the first century. Since the Christians had a natural indifference towards the Hebrew version, there were few copies, and those were mostly with the Jews. We have already discussed this in detail under the heading of the first contention.

The Sixth Evidence

All the versions of the sacred books that were written in the seventh or eighth centuries were destroyed and obliterated by the Jews simply because they were not in accordance with the copies that they possessed. This is why the scholars entrusted with the work of the revision of the Old Testament could not obtain even a single copy written in these two centuries. The result was that the Jews possessed only the copies that they thought were correct. They could easily have changed the texts of these copies without any fear of being found out or criticised.

The Seventh Evidence

The early history of the Christians was one of distress and trials, especially in the first three hundred years when they were subjected to great afflictions and faced massacre at many hands.

First Calamity

The first calamity they faced was in the year 64 in the reign of the emperor, Nero.¹ Peter, the apostle, his wife and Paul² were murdered in this event in Rome. To express faith in Christianity was a great offence at that time. This state of affairs remained unchanged until the emperor's death.

Second Calamity

This event took place in the reign of the emperor Domitian, who, like the emperor Nero, was known for being hostile to the Christian faith. He issued an order to kill the Christians which was followed by such a great massacre of the Christians that the existence of Christianity was endangered. John, the apostle, was exiled and Philip Clement was murdered.

Third Calamity

Another great trial of the Christians started in the year 101 at the hands of the emperor Trajan³ and continued for eighteen years. Ignatius, the bishop of Corinth, Clement, the bishop of Rome, and Simon, the bishop of Jerusalem, were all murdered.

Fourth Calamity

A great massacre of the Christians was recorded by history starting

1. He was the emperor of Rome from 54 to 64. He was the fifth Roman emperor and is famous for his barbarous killing of the Christians.

2. We are not sure that St. Paul was murdered in this event. May be that author has referred to some other Paul.

3. Trajan (53-117) reigned from 101-117. He is also known for his cruelty to the Christians.

in 161 at the hands the emperor Marcus Antonius. This homicidal period lasted for ten years. A great number of the Christians were killed in the East and the West.

Fifth Calamity

This event took place in the period of the emperor Septimius. Thousands of Christians were killed in the land of Egypt alone. Similarly in France and Carthage the Christians were massacred barbarously, to the extent that the Christians thought that the time of the Antichrist had arrived.

Sixth Calamity

In 237 the Emperor Maximus started killing the Christians. The majority of the Christian scholars were killed at his orders, as he estimated that it would be easier for him to rule them after the elimination of their scholars. The Popes Pontian and Fabian were killed.

Seventh Calamity

This terrible calamity of the Christians started in 253, in the period of the emperor Decius who had firmly resolved to root out the Christian faith and obliterate all signs of its existence. He issued orders to his governors to fulfil his intention. A great number of Christians had to abandon their faith. Egypt, Africa, Italy and cities of the East were the main centres of this calamity.

Eighth Calamity

This trial of the Christians started in 274. The emperor Aurelian also issued orders for killing the Christians but was killed before much damage to the lives of the Christians had taken place.

Ninth Calamity

Another general massacre of the Christians started in 302. The

whole land was red with blood. The city of Phrygia was burnt to ashes, leaving no single Christian alive.

Tenth Calamity

Diocletian, the famous Roman emperor who reigned from 284-305, persecuted the Christians because he felt that the increasing power of the Church endangered his kingdom.

If the above historical events are true, they leave little possibility of the sacred books having been preserved. It was also an ideal situation for people who wanted to change or alter the text. We have already shown that there were many heretical sects present in the first century who were busy making alterations in the texts.

The Eighth Evidence

The emperor Diocletian intended to obliterate every trace of the existence of the sacred books. He tried hard to achieve this goal and issued orders to demolish churches, burn all the books, stop the Christians from worshipping in the form of a congregation. These orders were carried out. The churches were levelled and all the books that he could find after an extensive search were burnt. Any Christian who was suspected of possessing a book was punished and tortured. This deprived the Christians of congregational worship. The details of these events can be found in the books of history. Lardner said on page 22 of the seventh volume of his book:

Diocletian passed orders that churches be abolished and books be burnt.

He further said:

Eusebius has given an eye-witness accounts of the event in a painful tone, saying, "I have seen with my own eyes the demolition of the churches and the burning of the sacred books in public places."

We do not claim that in these events all the sacred books were completely lost. What these events confirm is the fact that the existence of the copies of the sacred books remained very limited in number and, of course, many correct versions were completely lost.

The possibility cannot be denied that a certain book could have been totally lost and that some other book have been published in its name, since such occurrences were quite possible before the existence of the modern printing press. We have just shown that the copies written in the seventh and eighth centuries ceased to exist. Adam Clarke said in the introduction of his commentary:

The original of the exegesis that is attributed to Tatian has been completely lost, and the book which is ascribed to him now is doubtful to the scholars, and they are absolutely right in their doubts.

Watson said in the third volume of his book:

The exegesis attributed to Tatian was present in the time of Theodoret and was recited in every church. Theodoret abolished all its copies so that it could be replaced with the Evangel.

This shows how it was easy for Theodoret to abolish all the copies of a certain book and how another could be substituted in its name. There can be no doubt that Diocletian was more powerful than the Jews and stronger than Theodoret. It would not, therefore, be surprising if some books of the New Testament were completely destroyed at the hands of Diocletian or ceased to exist during other calamities before him, and if other books were substituted in their names, as we have seen in the case of the exegesis of Tatian.

This assumption, when seen in the light of the statement giving them religious licence to change the holy texts for the sake of the truth, is quite feasible and logical.

The historical events described above are the main cause for the non-existence of any authority supporting the books of the Old and New Testaments. Neither the Jews nor the Christians possess anything

to prove the truth of their scriptures. As we said earlier, when we asked some contemporary Christian scholars to produce authenticated proofs for the truth of their books in our famous public debate, they had to admit that, due to the calamities of the Christians in the first three hundred and thirteen years of their history, all such proofs had been destroyed. We also tried to find authorities to support the truth of the Biblical books but all our efforts ended in despair as what we found was no more than conjecture, which does not help prove the truth of these books.

The Fifth Contention

Sometimes the Christians make statements to the effect that the copies of the sacred books written in the period prior to the emergence of Islam are still in existence and that the present books are in accordance with them. This statement, in fact, consists of two separate claims, first that those versions were written before the emergence of Islam and second that the present books are identical copies of them. We intend to show that both claims are false and incorrect.

Let us first remind ourselves of the clear statement of Dr. Kennicott and others that the Jews themselves destroyed all the copies of the sacred books written in the seventh and eighth centuries, and that no copy of the Hebrew version written in these two centuries could be obtained. There were no copies to be found in any period preceding the tenth century. The oldest copy that Dr Kennicott was able to get was the Codex Laudianus which he claimed was written in the tenth century while de Rossi situated it in the eleventh century. Van der Hooght published a copy of the Hebrew version with a claim that it was the most correct of all the Hebrew versions. One can guess the profusion of errors that this copy contained.

The Ancient Versions of the Bible

Let us now examine the position of the Latin version. There are three versions that are considered among the Christians to be the oldest: the Codex Alexandrinus, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex

Ephraemi. The first is in London. It was this copy that was used for the first revision or correction of the present books. The second is in Italy and was used for the second revision. The third one is in Paris and bears the title "The Old Testament". It does not, however, contain the books of the Old Testament.

We can easily ascertain the position of all three versions through the witnesses provided by history.

The Codex Alexandrinus

In volume 2 of his book, Horne said describing the Codex Alexandrinus:

This copy consists of four volumes. The first three volumes contain the canonic as well as the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. The fourth volume consists of the New Testament and the First Epistle of Clement to Corinthians and the unacknowledged Book of Psalms which is attributed to Solomon.

Further he specified:

Before the Book of Psalms it has an epistle of Athanasius. This precedes the prayers that are recited in everyday rituals offered every hour. Then there are fourteen psalms related to the faith. The eleventh of these psalms is an eulogy to Mary. Some of these psalms are false, while others are derived from the Gospels. The arguments of Eusebius are written on the book of Psalms while his legislative notes are inscribed on the Gospels. Some scholars have been exaggerated in its praise while others disapproved of it in equally exaggerated fashion. Wettstein is considered to be its chief opponent.

The question of its antiquity has also been debated. Grabe and Sholtz estimated that it was written towards the end of the fourth century while Michaelis claimed that it was the oldest copy available and no other copy could be older than it because it contained the Epistle of Athanasius. Woide, on the other hand, situates it in the tenth centu-

ry. He also surmised that this was one of the copies that were collected in 615 in Alexandria for the Syrian translation. Dr Semler thinks that it was written in the seventh century. Montfaucon said that none of these copies, including the Codex Alexandrinus, can be said with certainty to have been written prior to the sixth century. Michaelis claimed that it was written after Arabic had become the language of Egypt. This places it one or two hundred years after the Muslim conquest of Alexandria. The basis of his claim is that the copier interchanged M and B with each other according to the Arabic rules of recitation. Woide concluded that since it is subdivided into chapters and various sections and bears the canonical notes of Eusebius it cannot be older than the fourth century. Spohn raised the following objections against the arguments forwarded by Woide:

- (1) The epistles of Paul (included in this copy) have not been divided into chapters and sections when this division was made in 396.
- (2) It contains the epistles of Clement when the reading of these letters was prohibited by the councils of Laodicea and Carthage. Sholtz deduced from this that it was written prior to 364.

The Codex Vaticanus

Horne said describing the Codex Vaticanus:

The introduction to the Greek translation printed in 1590 includes the claim that this codex was written sometime prior to 388. Montfaucon and Bianchini placed it in the fifth or sixth century. Dupin put it in the seventh century while Hug places it at the beginning of the fourth century and Marsh situates it towards the end of the fifth century. He has concluded that no other two copies are so completely different from each other as the Codex Alexandrinus and this codex.

He also said:

Dr. Kennicott also deduced that neither this codex nor the Codex Alexandrinus has been copied from the version of

Origen nor from the copies of it prepared in the period immediately after it. Both were copied from a version that does not bear any sign of the Origen version.

The Codex Ephraemi

Horne, describing the Codex Ephraemi, observed in the same volume:

Wettstein considers it to be one of the copies that were collected in Alexandria for the revision of the Syrian translation but there is nothing to support this opinion. He inferred this opinion from the marginal note that appeared against verse 7 of chapter 8 of the Epistle to Hebrews, saying that this version was prepared before 544 but Michaelis refuted this argument, only saying that it was an ancient version. Marsh has suggested that it was written in the seventh century.

The above is more than enough to convince us that no definite proof exists to specify the year of the compilation of these versions. The scholars have only made calculations and conjectures about the date of their origin on the basis of some indefinite indications which they have found in their books. These vague calculations obviously cannot authenticate any of the sacred books. Most of the arguments cited above are of the kind that do not stand up to reason. Semler's statement with regard to the Muslim domination over Egypt is unacceptable, as the language of a country could not possibly take over in such a short time. Alexandria was conquered by the Muslims in the seventh century, in the twentieth year of *Hijra*. Michaelis, however, forwarded strong arguments placing its writing in the tenth century. Woide's opinion that it was written in the tenth century seems quite logical because it was in this century that the practice of distorting the sacred texts became commonplace. Another indication of this is the fact that this copy contains three books that are not genuine, indicating that it must belong to a period in which it was difficult to distinguish between true and false which definitely applied to the tenth century.

This proves the falsity of the claim that these books were written

before the emergence of Islam. The other claim is also disproved by the fact that the Codex Alexandrinus contains books that are not genuine and that it has been condemned by some scholars, Wettstein being foremost among them, and that no other two copies are so completely different from each other as are the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Alexandrinus.

Now if, for a moment, we grant that the above three versions were written prior to the appearance of Islam, it does not make any difference to our contention, because we have never said that the sacred books were not distorted in the period preceding Islam and that all the distortions were only made after it. What we contend is that these books existed prior the period of Islam but they did not possess an unbroken chain of authority to prove their authenticity. They were certainly distorted even before the time of Islam. The presence of a number of books in the pre-Islamic period does not, therefore, help prove their authenticity. The presence of the above three versions in that period, if ever proved, would only add to the number of the books distorted by earlier generations.

ABROGATION IN THE BIBLE

The word 'abrogation' literally signifies annulment, nullification or cancellation. In Muslim terminology, however, it means the expiration of the period of the validity of a practical injunction. The occurrence of abrogation is related only to injunctions that are not eternal and are equal with regard to the possibility of their existence or non-existence.

Abrogation can never be taken to mean that God commanded or prohibited something and then thought better of it and decided to cancel His former command. This is impossible because it involves attributing ignorance to God. May God forbid. Similarly it is not possible for God to command or prohibit something and then without any change in time, subject or conditions to abrogate His injunction since that would lead to attributing imperfection to God. God is free of any imperfection whatsoever.

What the abrogation signifies is that Allah knows that a certain injunction will remain valid for people up to certain time and then cease to be applicable. When that specific time is reached, a new command is sent which seems to either abrogate or change the former injunction but which, in fact, does nothing but mark the expiration of its validity. Since the former command did not have a specific period of validity attached to it, we take the new injunction as a cancelation of the former.

For example, you might command one of your servants to do a certain job with the intention of asking him to do some other job after one year, without, however, disclosing your intention to him. After the completion the year, when you ask him to do the other job, he might well think that you have changed or amended your orders, even though you have not, in fact, made any changes in your plans. Like all other changing phenomena around us, these apparent changes or amendments in the divine injunctions are the part of divine wisdom whether we know its significance or not.

The False Nature of the Biblical Changes

Keeping the above definition in view, we can confidently assert that none of the historical events of the Old or New Testament have undergone abrogation, but rather some of these events have been changed and fabricated. The following are a few examples out of many of such events:

1. The event describing the alleged adultery of the Prophet Lot with his two daughters and their subsequent pregnancy. This false description appears in chapter 19 of the Book of Genesis.
2. Judah, the son of the Prophet Jacob is described as having committed adultery with the wife of his son who then gave birth to the twin brothers Pharez and Zarah. It may be noted that the Prophets, David, Solomon and Jesus are the descendants of this supposedly illegitimate son, Pharez. This description can be found in chapter 38 of Genesis and the genealogy of Christ in chapter 1 of Matthew.
3. The Prophet David is similarly described as having committed adultery with the wife of Uriah, making her pregnant, then killing her husband Uriah deceitfully and finally marrying her. This description appears in chapter 11 of II Samuel.
4. The Prophet Solomon is accused of becoming an apostate by converting to idol-worship in his old age and erecting temples for the idols. This appears in I Kings chapter 11.
5. The Prophet Aaron is similarly accused of making a golden calf-god for the Israelites and building altar for it and subsequently turning to its worship. This is mentioned in Exodus chapter 32.

We would like to re-emphasize that all the above historical events are false and fabricated and have certainly never been abrogated as all historical events fall outside of the possibility of abrogation. Similarly we refute the claim of abrogation for the Book of Psalms as it is a collection of prayers. We do not think that the Book of Psalms abrogated the Torah and was itself abrogated later by the Evangel, as has been

falsely claimed by the Christian author of *Meezan-ul-Haqq* who has wrongly asserted that this is claimed by the Holy Qur'an and its commentaries.

Our disbelief in the laws of the Biblical books is based on the fact that they lack authenticity and are of a dubious nature and because of the fact that they have certainly been corrupted and distorted by people through the ages as we have proved earlier in this book.

We may, however, state that injunctions which fall into categories other than those defined above have the possibility of abrogation. Therefore it is valid to posit that some of the injunctions enjoined by the Torah and the Evangel have been abrogated by the Holy Qur'an. We never claim, however, that the laws of the Torah and the Evangel have been abrogated by the Qur'an as a whole. It is not possible because we see that there are certain injunctions of the Torah that certainly have not been abrogated by the Holy Qur'an; for example, false witness, murder, adultery, sodomy, theft and perjury are all prohibited in Islam as they are in the law of Moses. Similarly the obligation to respect one's parents, and respect for the property and honour of one's neighbour, and the prohibition of matrimonial relations with father, grandfather, mother, uncle and aunt are common to the law of Moses and the law of the Qur'an. They are therefore clearly not abrogated.

Similarly there are certain evangelic injunctions that certainly have not been abrogated. For example we find in the Gospel of Mark:

Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind and with thy strength. And the second is like namely this, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.¹

Both the above injunctions are also emphatically enjoined by Qur'anic law as well. They have certainly not been abrogated. Besides, abrogation is not unique to Islamic law. It is also found in the previous laws as well. Abrogation may be categorised into two main

1. Mark 12:29-31.

kinds. Firstly certain injunctions enjoined by earlier Prophets may be abrogated by the laws of a succeeding Prophet. Secondly, abrogation may occur in the law of the same Prophet with regard to some previous injunction. There are innumerable examples of both the kinds of abrogation in the Old and New Testaments. We would like to present a few example of each in the following pages.

Biblical Examples of the First Kind of Abrogation

First Example: Marriage between Brothers and Sisters

The marriage between brothers and sisters was admissible in the law of the Prophet Abraham. The wife of the Prophet Abraham was his sister as is understood from his own statement in Genesis 20:12:

And yet indeed she is my sister; she is the daughter of my father but not the daughter of my mother and she became my wife.

Later marriage with one's sister whether the daughter of one's father or the daughter of one's mother was absolutely prohibited and became equal to adultery and anyone who did it accursed and liable to execution.

We read the following statement in Leviticus 18:9:

The nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father or daughter of thy mother, whether she be born at home or born abroad; even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover.

Making comments on this verse D'Oyly and Richard Mant remarked:

Such a marriage is equal to adultery.

We also find the following statement in Leviticus 20:17:

And if a man shall take his sister, his father's daughter or his mother's daughter, and see her nakedness, and she sees his nakedness; it is a wicked thing; and they shall be cut off in the

sight of their people: he hath uncovered his sister's nakedness; he shall bear his iniquity.

Another similar statement we find in Deuteronomy 27:22:

Cursed be he that lieth with his sister, the daughter of his father or the daughter of his mother.

Now in view of the above statements, we are forced to deduce that matrimonial relations between brother and sister were admissible under the law of Adam and Abraham (peace be on them), otherwise it would mean that all human beings are illegitimate and their parents adulterers, to be cursed and liable to be killed. Besides a Prophet can in no way be imagined to have committed such a shameful act. Therefore we must accept that such marriage was admissible in the law of both these Prophets and then that this possibility was later on abrogated by subsequent Prophets.

A Distortion By the Arabic Translator

The translation of Genesis 20:12 has been changed quite outrageously by the Arabic translator who rendered it in these words:

She is my father's relative not my mother's.

Apparently this alteration was made to avoid any accusation of wrong action on the part of the Prophet Abraham in respect of his marriage to Sarah, as a father's relatives include the daughters of his uncles and aunts and the daughters of his brothers and sisters and many other relations.

Second Example: Sanction to Eat Various Animals

Genesis 9:3, according to the Arabic translation printed in 1625, contains this commandment of Allah to the prophet Noah:

Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you;

even as the green herb have I given you all things.¹

This allows us to understand that the meat of all the animals was admissible just like the vegetables, while in the law of Moses we find many animals like pigs etc. to have been prohibited as is clear from Leviticus² chapter 2 and Deuteronomy chapter 14.

Third Example: Two Sisters as Wives

The Prophet Jacob was married to two sisters at the same time who were the daughters of his aunt, their names being Leah and Rachel. This is mentioned in Genesis chapter 29.³ We find that all such marriages are prohibited in the law of Moses. The book of Leviticus 18:18 contains this statement:

Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her lifetime.

It is clear that marrying two sisters must have been permitted in the law of Jacob, otherwise we would be forced to say that all the descendants of such a marriage were illegitimate, when we all know that all the Israelite Prophets, Jesus included, are the descendants of Jacob.

Fourth Example: Marriage With Father's Sister

We have already mentioned that Imran, the father Moses, married Jechobed who was his father's sister, when such marriages were forbidden in the Law of Moses as is known from Leviticus 18:12:

Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister; She is thy father's near kinswoman.

1. This passage has been taken from the King James version which is exactly in accordance with the quote of our author from the Arabic.

2. "And the swine, though he divides the hoof and be cloven footed, yet he cheweth not the cud he is unclean to you, of their flesh shall ye not eat."

3. See particularly verses 23 to 30.

Another statement to this effect is also found in chapter 20 verse 19 of the same book.¹ This again leads us to conclude that such marriages had religious sanction prior to the law of Moses which later abrogated them. Otherwise it would again force us to consider the Prophets Moses and Aaron and their sister Mary to be illegitimate and would also mean that none of them could enter the congregation of God for up to ten generations afterwards as is known from Deuteronomy 23:3. If blessed people like them are precluded from entering the congregation of the Lord, who else would be able to enter it?

Fifth Example

We find the following statement in the Book of Jeremiah:

Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord.²

It is not difficult to see that the words, "I will make a new covenant," in the above verse refer to a new divine law that was going to be sent to abrogate the existing laws. According to Paul's claim in his Epistle to the Hebrews, the new covenant referred to in the above verse is none other than the law of Jesus.³ According to this admission of Paul, the Law of Jesus abrogated the law of Moses.

The above five are common to the Jews and the Christians as examples of the presence of abrogation in the Bible.

There are also many examples which are specifically related to the Christians. The following are some of them.

1. "And thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister, nor of thy father's sister: for he uncovereth his near kin."

2. Jer. 31:31,32.

3. See Hebrews 7:8-12. It also contains words to the effect that when God takes a new covenant he holds the former as old, indicating that being old it is about to be abrogated.

Sixth Example: Sanction of Divorce

It was permissible in the Law of Moses for a man to divorce his wife for any reason and also for a divorced woman to remarry another man as soon as she left her first husband's home. This can be ascertained from chapter 24 of Deuteronomy. In Christian law, however, a man is not allowed to divorce his wife until she is found to have committed adultery, and besides, Christian law precludes marriage with divorced women, considering it a crime equal to adultery.

The Gospel of Matthew chapter 19 verse 15 contains the following statement of Jesus which he made while replying to the objections of the Pharisees on this matter:

He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you who so ever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another committeth adultery, and who so marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

One can easily understand from the above statement that abrogation occurred twice regarding this injunction, once in the law of Moses and once in the law of Jesus. We also understand from the above statement that sometimes an injunction is introduced only to meet the demands of the circumstances prevailing in certain time though the injunction itself may not be good.

Seventh Example

There were many animals whose meat was not permissible according to the law of Moses while later, by Christian law, this prohibition was abrogated. And according to the judgement of Paul this permission was further generalised to include almost all animals. Paul's Epistle to the Romans 14:14 contains this statement:

I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself, but to him that esteemeth anything

to be unclean, to him it is unclean.

Further he said in his Epistle to Titus 1:15:

Unto the pure all things are pure but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure, but even their minds and conscience is defiled.

These two principles, that something should be unclean only to those who consider it unclean and that everything should be clean and permissible to the believers, are quite strange. They imply that the Israelites were not clean enough to have permission to eat all animals, as the Christians can. Paul made a conscious effort to publicise this permission to consume the meat of all animals. He said in his letter to Timothy 4:4:

For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused; if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer. If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ.

Eighth Example: Precepts of the Feast and the Sabbath

All the injunctions related to feast days, that are contained in chapter 23 of Leviticus, were made eternal obligations for the people by the law of Moses. There are many words in verses 14, 21, 31 and 41 of this chapter that explicitly indicate the eternal nature of this injunction:

It shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations in all your dwellings.¹

This eternally binding statute was abrogated later on by Paul.

Besides this, the law of Moses made the observance of the Sabbath an eternal obligation. No one was permitted to do any work whatsoever-

1. Lev. 23:14

er on that day and anyone deviating from this eternal law was liable to execution. There are many places in the books of the Old Testament where the eternal nature of this injunction is emphatically emphasized; for example Genesis 2:3, Exodus 20:8-11, Exodus 23:12 and 34:21, Leviticus 19:3 and 23:2, Deuteronomy 5:12-15, Jeremiah 17, Isaiah 56 and 58, chapter nine of Nehemiah and chapter 20 of Ezekiel. The following passage is from Exodus 31:13-17:

Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that sanctify you. Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you. Everyone that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord; whosoever doth any work in the sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath to observe the sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.

Exodus 35:2-3 contains the following statement:

Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day; a sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day.

The following event is described in Numbers 15:32-36:

And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they

put him into ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died.

We know that the Jews in the time of Jesus used to annoy and trouble him and wanted to kill him for his disregard for the Sabbath. To justify their disbelief in the prophethood of Jesus, one of their arguments was that Jesus used to work on the day of the Sabbath. We read the following statement in the Gospel of John 5:16:

And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus and sought to slay him because he had done these things on the Sabbath day.

The Gospel of John 9:16 also contains the following:

Therefore said some of the Pharisees, This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the sabbath day.

It should be noted that all the injunctions mentioned in examples seven, eight and nine were abrogated by Paul, as is understood from his letter to Colossians 2:16:

Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon or of the sabbath days: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.

Under the comments on this verse the commentary of D'Oyly and Richard Mant goes:

Burkitt and Dr. Whitby said that the Jews had three kinds of feasts, annual, monthly and weekly,¹ then all of them were

1. The annual feast of the Jews is called the 'Passover' the monthly feast was celebrated by offering sacrifices at the sight of the new moon while the weekly celebration was the observance of the Sabbath.

abrogated, even the Sabbath.

Under his comments on the same verse Bishop Horsley said:¹

The Sabbath of the Jewish Church has ceased to exist. The Christians did not take to the childish practices of the Jews in their Sabbath observance.

Henry and Scott said in their commentary:

When Jesus abrogated the conventional law² no one has any right to blame other people for not observing it. Beausobre said that had it been obligatory for all to observe the Sabbath and binding upon all the nations, its abrogation would have not been possible, although it has now in fact been abrogated. Similarly it would have been obligatory for the Christians throughout their generations.

Paul's claim that these injunctions were not correct is not in accordance with the text of the Torah, as God specified that the animals prohibited for them are unclean and that:

Ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be Holy; for I am Holy.³

The main reason for the "feast of unleavened bread" is:

And this day shall be unto you for a memorial and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations.⁴

1. The authors of the Oxford Bible concordance said that this prohibition (of not working on the day of Sabbath) had become unbearable and impractical to the Jews during the period of their exile. For this reason Christ protested against it.

2. This refers to the law of Moses that strictly enjoined the observance of the Sabbath day.

3. Lev. 11:44.

4. Exodus 12:14. The Feast of Unleavened Bread is celebrated by the Jews and continues for seven days starting from 15th April every year. Chapters 11 and 12 have detailed descriptions with regard to this feast.

Similarly the reason for the Feast of Tabernacles¹ is described as follows:

That your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought out of the land of Egypt.²

The reason for the Sabbath has been described in many places as follows:

For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.³

Ninth Example: The Obligation of Circumcision

The obligation of circumcision was everlasting and perpetual in the law of the Prophet Abraham, (peace be on him), as can be understood from Genesis, 17. This injunction remained as an obligation for the descendants of the Prophets Isaac and Ismail and continued to be so in the law of Moses as well. We find this injunction in Leviticus 12:13:

And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised.

Jesus himself was also circumcised as is clear from the Gospel of Luke.⁴ The Christians still commemorate the day of his circumcision by offering a special prayer. This obligation continued to be observed until after the ascension of Christ. It was later abrogated by the Apostles of Christ. This is unambiguously mentioned in chapter 15 of

1. The feast of Tabernacles was celebrated by the Jews for seven days starting from 15th Oct. every year. They used to offer many sacrifices every day of the feast. The detailed description and injunctions are mentioned in Numbers 29:12-40. This was celebrated in the memory of the day when the Israelites were first provided with tents in the wilderness.

2. Lev. 23:43.

3. Exodus 20:11.

4. "And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called Jesus." Luke 2:21

the Book of Acts and we are going to discuss it under example no. 12.

Paul emphatically advocated its abrogation. He writes in his Epistle to the Galatians, chapter 5:

Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.¹

And the same letter contains the following statement:

For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.²

Tenth Example: Precepts of Sacrifice

There were a number of injunctions regarding the offering of sacrifices that were eternal and everlasting in the law of Moses and that have been abrogated by Christian Law.

Eleventh Example: Regulations of the High Priest

There were many injunctions that were specially assigned to the family of Aaron, like the dress for ritual services and priesthood etc. These injunctions were of a perpetual nature but were declared as abrogated in Christian Law.

Twelfth Example: The Abrogation of the Law of Moses

The Apostles, after great deliberation, declared almost all the injunctions of the Torah as abrogated except the following four precepts: the prohibitions on sacrifices offered to idols, the consumption

1. Gal. 2:6.
2. Gal. 6:15.

of blood and animals killed by strangling, and fornication. These things are mentioned in chapter 15 of the Book of Acts. We quote some of them:

For as much we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, ye must be circumcised and keep the law: to whom we gave no such commandment.¹

After some lines it also says:

For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things, that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well.²

The prohibition of the above things was kept unchanged simply so that Jews, who were new converts to Christianity, should not react to this abrogation, as they still held the injunctions of the Torah dear to them. After some time, when Paul was sure that this prohibition was no longer necessary, he abrogated the first three injunctions as we have discussed under the seventh example, and now all the Protestants have a consensus of opinion on it. Since there is no specific punishment for fornication mentioned by Christian law, this too is to all intents and purposes abrogated. In short, Christian law has abrogated all the practical injunctions of the law of Moses, be they of eternal nature or otherwise.

Thirteenth Example: Abandonment of the Torah

Paul said in his letter to the Galatians:

I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the

1. Acts 15:24.
2. Acts 15:28-29.

flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the Law,¹ then Christ is dead in vain.²

Dr. Hammond has commented on this verse as follows:

That is, giving his soul for me he relieved me from the law of Moses.

And in his comments on verse 21 he said:

It is why he chose this freedom. I do not trust the law of Moses for salvation and do not consider it necessary because it would invalidate the Evangel.

Dr. Whitby said under his comments on verse 20:

Had it been the case, it would have been unnecessary to purchase salvation through death, nor would such a death have been of any use.

Pyle said:

Had the Jewish laws been necessary for our salvation and redemption it would have been unnecessary for Jesus to sacrifice his life; and if this law remains essential for our salvation, the death of the Christ would not be sufficient for it.

All the above statements are enough witness to the fact that the law of Moses has been completely abrogated.

Fourteenth Example: The Law of Moses under the Curse

Chapter 3 of the same letter contains the following statements:

For as many as are of the works of the law are under the

-
1. The Law here refers to the Law of Moses, or the Pentateuch or Torah.
 2. Gal. 2:20.

curse.¹

But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God.²

And the law is not of faith.³

Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us.⁴

Lardner says on page 487 of volume 9 of his commentary:

On this occasion the apostle is generally understood to mean that the law of Moses was abrogated or at least lost its validity after the crucifixion of Christ.

Further on the same page he has:

The apostle clearly elucidated that the result of Jesus' death is the abrogation of the prescribed laws.

Fifteenth Example: The Law Abrogated by Faith

Paul's letter to Galatians clearly says:

Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come we are no longer under a schoolmaster.⁵

This statement of Paul says unambiguously that after belief in Jesus the injunctions of the Torah are no longer needed. The commentary of D'Oyly and Richard Mant contains the following statement of Dean Stanhope:

-
1. Gal 3:10.
 2. Gal 3:11.
 3. Gal 3:12.
 4. Gal 3:13.
 5. Gal. 3:23-25.

The regulations of the law were abrogated after the death of Jesus and after the spread of the evangelic revelation.

Sixteenth Example: The Law must be changed

Paul said in his Epistle to the Hebrews:

For the priesthood being changed there is made of necessity a change also of the law.¹

This verse shows that a change of priesthood essentially changes the previous law. Under the same principle the Muslims are justified in their contention that Christian law has also been abrogated (by the appearance of the Holy Prophet, peace be on him). The following statement appears in the commentary of D'Oyly and Richard Mant:

The Law has been certainly abrogated with regard to the injunction of sacrifices and cleanliness.

Seventeenth Example

In chapter 7 verse 18 of the same Epistle we find:

For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.

This verse is unambiguous in saying that the main cause of abrogation of the law of Moses was that it was weak and unprofitable. The commentary of Henry and Scott contains the following statement:

The law and the priesthood that were unable to be perfected were abrogated, and the new priesthood and mercy rose to give perfection to the righteous.

Eighteenth Example: The Torah was Defective

Paul says in his letter to the Hebrews:

1. Heb. 7:12.

For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second.¹

Further in verse 13 he says:

A new covenant he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

The above statement implies that the injunctions contained in the Pentateuch (Torah) are old and defective and therefore should be abrogated. D'Oyly and Richard Mant quoted the following comments of Pyle on the verse quoted above:

It is evidently clear that the will of God is that he should abrogate the old and defective with the new or better message. It therefore abrogates the Jewish faith and ordains the Christian faith in its place.

Nineteenth Example

Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews 10:9 has:

He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.

Again the following statement of Pyle was quoted by D'Oyly and Richard Mant in their commentary with regard to verses 8 and 9:

The apostles made deductions from these two verses and declared that the sacrifices of the Jews were not enough. For this reason Christ chose death for himself to make up for this lack and by the one action he abrogated the validity of the other.

Conclusions

Any sensible reader of the above examples and statements will inevitably arrive at the following conclusions:

1. Heb. 8:7.

1. The abrogation of some precepts in a preceding law is not limited to Islamic law alone. The occurrence of abrogation of preceding laws is quite normal.
2. All the injunctions of the law of Moses, be they eternal or otherwise, were abrogated by the law of Jesus.
3. Paul's writings also speak of abrogation with regard to the whole Torah together with its injunctions.
4. Paul proved that a change of priesthood also necessitates a change of law.
5. Paul claimed that everything that becomes old has to vanish away. This allows us to contend that the law of Jesus being older than the law of Muhammad (peace be on both of them) must be abrogated. It should be noted that Paul and other exegetes, in spite of their admission that the injunctions of the Torah were ordained by God, used discourteous and improper words for them.
6. According to our definition of abrogation there is nothing wrong and objectionable about the injunctions of the Torah being abrogated.¹ However the statements indicating eternity and insisting that they should be enforced through the generations put some injunctions beyond the scope of abrogation and make their abrogation objectionable. We are free from this objection because, firstly we do not believe the present Pentateuch to be the original word of God or written by Moses as we have produced scores of proofs to show, secondly, as we have shown, the present Pentateuch has been subjected to great distortions and alterations, and thirdly, according to Christian belief, God may regret and be ashamed of some of his acts and feel regretful about some of his previous orders, causing him to change them afterwards. Similarly he is imputed with making everlasting promises and then not fulfilling them as is asserted by some of the books of the Old Testament. The Muslims are absolutely

1. That is, with the change of time and circumstances it is quite admissible and reasonable to change the precepts to meet new requirements.

free from such impure and polluted thought.

As far as their interpretations with regard to the words of eternity¹ are concerned, they cannot be justified and accepted for the obvious reason that the words must be taken to mean what they say.

The Second Kind of Abrogation in the Bible²

First Example

God asked Abraham to slay his son and offer him as a sacrifice to the Lord, but this injunction was abrogated before being practised. The whole story of this event is related in chapter 22 of Genesis.

Second Example: Promise of Priesthood Abrogated

I Samuel 2:30 contains the following statement of a prophet to Eli,³ the Priest:

Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, 'I said indeed that thy house and the house of thy father, should walk before me for ever: but now the Lord saith, 'Be it far from me; for that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.

Further in verse 35 it says:

And I will raise me up a faithful Priest.

1. The Christians usually contend that the injunctions containing the words 'ever' and 'always' etc. signify up to the end of the period of the Old Testament. It may be noted that at many places of the Pentateuch the words 'through generations' or other expressions to the same effect have been used to indicate eternity, for instance, Genesis 17:12 and Exodus 12:12.

2. That is, the abrogation of a former injunction of a particular Prophet within the same dispensation.

3. Eli, the priest, is one of the ancient judges of the Jews who brought up the prophet Samuel. He was promised that priesthood would continue for ever in his family but on account of the perversion of his sons God abolished this priesthood from his family.

God first made promise that the priesthood would remain in the family of Eli the Priest, and in the family of his father, but in the latter statement he transferred the promised priesthood to a new priest. The commentary of D'Oyly and Richard Mant contains the following statement of Patrick:

God abrogated the injunction promising the priesthood to Eli and his family. The priesthood was then given to Eleazar the elder son of Aaron. Then it was given to Tamar, the younger son of Aaron. For the sins of Eli's sons the priesthood was transferred to the family of the priest, Eleazer.

This implies that the above promise of priesthood was abrogated twice in the law of Moses and it was abrogated a third time with the coming of the law of Jesus. The priesthood did not remain in the family of Eleazar nor in the family of Tamar either. The promise made to Eleazar is described in chapter 25 of the Book of Numbers in the following words:

Behold, I give unto him my covenant of peace: and he shall have it and his seed after him, even the covenant of an everlasting priesthood.¹

It should not come as a surprise to learn that according to Judaeo-Christian thought, God may go against his everlasting promise. The books of the Old Testament contain statements claiming that God repents and regrets after having done a certain thing. For instance Psalm 88 contains David's address to God in these words:

Thou hast made void the covenant of thy servant: Thou hast profaned his crown by casting it to the ground.

And Genesis 6:6-7 contains the following statement:

And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will

1. Num. 25:12,13.

destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth, both man and beast, and the creeping things, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them.

Verse 6 and the last phrase of verse 7, "It repenteth me..." are clear in implying that God is regretful about what He has done. Psalm 106:44 contains the words:

Nevertheless he regarded their affliction when he heard their cry: and remembered for them his covenant and repented according to the multitude of his mercies.¹

I Samuel 15:11 contains God's statement in these words:

It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king: for he is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandments.

Further in verse 35 of the same chapter we find:

Samuel mourned for Saul: and the Lord repented that he had made Saul king over Israel.

In view of the above statements containing "God's repentance" and "his regrets" about creating man and making Saul the king of Israel, the possibility of "God's repentance" on making Jesus a Prophet cannot be ruled out as Jesus' "claim of being God incarnate" is a greater sin than the disobedience of Saul. God, according to the above statement, did not know that Saul would not perform his commandments, similarly it makes it possible that God might have not known that Jesus would "claim to be God" after becoming a Prophet. We neither believe in the possibility of God's repentance nor do we accept that Jesus made any claim to godhood. We believe that God is absolutely free from such imperfections and Jesus is very far from making such false claims.

1. In the present Urdu version it has been changed to this effect: "He showed pity according to the multitude of his kindness." Perhaps this is the latest example of distortion in the text.

Ezekiel 4:10 contains the following injunction:

And thy meat which thou shalt eat, shall be by weight, twenty shekels a day.

And in verse 12 it says:

And thou shalt eat it as barley cakes, and thou shalt bake it with dung that cometh out of man.

Further in verses 14 and 15 it contains:

Then said I, Ah Lord God; behold, my soul hath not been polluted: for from my youth up even till now, have I not eaten of that which dieth of itself, or is torn in pieces; neither came there abominable flesh into my mouth. Then He said unto me, Lo, I have given thee cow's dung for man's dung, and thou shalt prepare thy bread therewith.

According to this statement God first commanded Ezekiel to prepare his bread with the filth of man then after Ezekiel's supplications he abrogated His first commandment and changed it by allowing cow's dung in place of man's.

Fourth Example: The Place of Sacrifice

We read in Leviticus 17:3,4:

What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp and bringeth it not unto the door of tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord; blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people.

In contrast to this we find this statement in Deuteronomy 12:15:

Thou mayst kill and eat flesh in all thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, according to the blessing of the Lord, thy God which he hath given thee.

Further in verses 20 to 22 it says:

When the Lord thy God shall enlarge thy border, as he hath promised thee, and thou shalt say, I will eat flesh, because thy soul longeth to eat flesh; thou mayest eat flesh, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after. If the place which the Lord thy God hath chosen to put his name there be too far from thee, than thou shalt kill of thy herd and of thy flock, which the Lord hath given thee, as I have commanded thee, and thou shalt eat in thy gates whatsoever thy soul lusteth after. Even as the roebuck and the hart is eaten, so thou shalt eat them: the unclean and the clean shall eat of them alike.

The above statement abrogates the commandment of God contained in Leviticus quoted earlier. Horne, after quoting these verses, said on page 619 of the first volume of his book:

Apparently these two places are contradictory to each other, but keeping in view the fact that according to the circumstances of the Israelites changes in the law of Moses were usual, and the law did not preclude changes.

Further he said:

In the fortieth year of his migration and prior to his coming to Palestine, Moses abrogated this injunction through the injunctions of Deuteronomy and permitted them after coming to Palestine to eat the goats and cows wherever they liked.

This commentator admits the presence of abrogation in these verses and also is convinced that changes were made in the law of Moses according to the changing circumstances. In the light of this how can they justify themselves raising objections against other religions for minor changes and why do they insist that abrogation necessarily attributes ignorance to God?

Fifth Example: The Workers of the Tabernacle

Numbers 4:3,23,30,35,39,43 and 46 make us understand that the number of the workers in the Tabernacle should not be less than twenty-five or more than fifty, while 8:24-25 of the same book say that this number should not be less than two or more than fifty.

Sixth Example: The Sin Offering of the Congregation

Leviticus 4:14 says:

The congregation shall offer a young bullock for the sin.

Numbers chapter 15 contains:

All the congregation shall offer.... one kind of the goats for a sin offering.

The first injunction is abrogated by the second.

Seventh Example

From Genesis chapter 6 God's commandment is understood to be that two living creatures of every sort should be carried in Noah's Ark, while from chapter 7 it is understood that seven of every clean beast, and two of every unclean beast are to be taken.¹ Further in the same chapter we are informed that two of each kind were taken into the Ark. This statement in this way was abrogated twice.

Eighth Example: Hezekiah's Illness

II Kings 20:1-6 says:

In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the Prophet Isaiah, the son of Amoz came to him and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord. Set thine house in order; for thou

1. "Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens, the male and his female."

shalt die, and not live. Then he turned his face to the wall, and Prayed unto the Lord, saying, I beseech thee O Lord, remember now how I have walked before thee in truth and with a perfect heart, and have done that which is good in thy sight. And Hezekiah wept sore. And it came to pass, afore Isaiah was gone out into the middle court, that word of the Lord came to him, saying, 'Turn again and tell Hezekiah the captain of my people, Thus saith the Lord, the God of David, thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears: behold, I will heal thee: On the third day thou shalt go up unto the house of the Lord. And I will add unto thy days fifteen years.

Ninth Example: The Mission of the Twelve

The Gospel of Matthew 10:5 has:

These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them saying, go not into the way of the Gentiles, and unto any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

The Gospel of Matthew contains the following statement of Christ with regard to his own mission in chapter 15 verse 24:

I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

These show that Jesus sent his disciples only to the Israelites. The Gospel of Mark, however, 16:15 has recorded Jesus as saying:

Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.¹

According to Mark this statement was made by Christ just before his ascension to Heaven. Hence this abrogated the former statement.

1. The former statement has been abrogated by the latter above.

Tenth Example: Command to Observe the Law of Moses

The Gospel of Matthew chapter 23 verse 1 contains the words:

Then spoke Jesus to the multitude, and his disciples saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do.

This statement is clear in implying that they are being commanded to obey what the Pharisees say, and there is no doubt that the Pharisees insist on the observance all the practical injunctions of the Torah and particularly the injunctions that are of an eternal nature, when in fact all of them were abrogated by Christian law, as we have demonstrated in detail when discussing the first kind of abrogation.

It is strange that Protestant scholars often reproduce these verses as an argument against the abrogation of the Torah. This means that they should be killed for not keeping the Sabbath, since the law of Moses declared that such men must be killed. We have discussed this in detail under the first kind of abrogation.

Eleventh Example

We have already shown under the thirteenth example of the first kind of abrogation that the Apostles abrogated all the practical injunctions of the Torah except four injunctions out of which three were abrogated later by Paul.

Twelfth Example

Luke 9:56 contains the following statement of Jesus:

For the son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.

John 3:17 and 12:47 also contain the same statement but Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians 2:8 contains this statement:

And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy

with the brightness of his coming.

The latter statement obviously abrogates the former injunction.

In view of the above examples of the presence of both kinds of abrogation in the Old and New Testaments, the claim made by the Judaeo-Christian scholars, that there is no possibility of abrogation in the Bible, is proved false and incorrect beyond any doubt. We may, however, repeat that with the change of time, place and the circumstances of the subject, certain changes in legal injunctions are quite logical and even necessary in order to meet the new requirements of the subject of the Law. Certain injunctions may be useful and proper for the people at one time, and unnecessary and inappropriate at another.

THE INNOVATION OF THE TRINITY

The Impossibility of the Doctrine of Trinity

At the beginning of this section we would like to make the following twelve points which, we are sure, will help the reader have easy access to the truth.

First Point: Who is God?

The books of the Old Testament bear witness to the fact that God (Allah) is one, the Everlasting, the Undying. He has absolute power over everything and can do anything He likes. He has no equal. None is similar to him neither in essence nor in attributes. He is independent of physical form or features. These facts are so abundantly found in these books that no examples are needed.

Second Point: The Prohibition of Worshipping Anything Other than Him

This prohibition is clearly mentioned in many places of the Pentateuch, for example in Exodus, chapters 20 and 34. We even find it mentioned in Deuteronomy chapter 13 that any Prophet or anyone receiving inspiration were to ask people to worship other than God alone, even in a dream, he should be killed no matter how many miracles he performed. Similarly anyone encouraging his friends or relatives to look to other gods must be stoned to death. Chapter 17 of the same book declares that anyone found guilty of worshipping other gods, man or woman, shall be stoned to death.

The Third Point: The Attribution of Physical Features to God

There are many verses of the books of the Old Testament that mention different limbs, physical form and features in connection with God.

For example Genesis 1:26,27 and 9:6 mentions God's face and other limbs. Isaiah 50:17 contains a description of the head of God,

while in Daniel 7:9 the head and hair of God are mentioned.

A list of some passages containing descriptions of physical features and limbs etc. in connection with God is given below:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Genesis, 1:26:27 and 9:6 | Face and other Limbs. |
| 2. Isaiah 59:17 | Head. |
| 3. Daniel 7:9 | Head and Hair. |
| 4. Psalms 43:3 | Face, Hand and Arm. |
| 5. Exodus 33:23 | Face and Neck. |
| 6. Psalms 33:15 | Eyes and Ears. |
| 7. Daniel 9 | Eyes and Ears. |
| 8. I Kings 8:29 | The Eyes. |
| 9. Jeremiah 16:17,32; 19 | The Eyes. |
| 10. Job 34:21 | The Eyes. |
| 11. Proverbs: 5:21; 15:3 | The Eyes. |
| 12. Psalms 10:4 | The Eyes & Lashes. |
| 13. Psalms 17:6,8,9,10 | The Ear, Foot, Nose & Mouth. |
| 14. Isaiah 30:27 | Lips and Tongue. |
| 15. Deuteronomy 33 | Hands and Feet. |
| 16. Exodus 31:18 | Fingers. |
| 17. Jeremiah 4:19 | Belly and Heart. |
| 18. Isaiah 21 | Back. |
| 19. Acts 20:28 | Blood. |

There are two verses in the Pentateuch that speak of God as being metaphysical i.e. free from form and features. Deuteronomy 4:12 says:

And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice.

Further in verse 15:

Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto

you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire.

Since the above two verses correspond to human reason, they do not require explanations as do the others listed above.

Similarly there are verses in the Bible that relate God to space. Such verses are present in both the Old and the New Testaments. Some of them are listed below:

Exodus:	25:8; 29:45, 46
Numbers:	5:3; 35:34
Deuteronomy:	26:15
II Samuel:	7:5,6
I Kings :	8:30,32,34,36,39,45,49
Psalms:	9:11; 10:4; 25:8; 67:16; 73:2; 75:2; 98:1; 134:21
Joel	3:17,21
Zachariah:	8:3
Matthew:	5:45,48; 6:1,9,14,26; 7:11,21; 10:32,33; 3:50; 15:12; 16:17; 18:10,14,19,35; 23:9,22

All the above verses connect God to space.¹ There are very few verses in the Old and New Testaments that describe God as being beyond space and time. Two examples are Isaiah 66:1,2² and Acts 7:48.³ Since these few verses are acceptable to human reason, and in accordance with rational arguments, they do not require any explanation. The other verses ascribing space to God, however, require interpretation. The Judaeo-Christian scholars also agree with us that such verses require some explanation.

Fourth Point: Metaphorical Meanings of the Words

It has been confirmed above that God has no physical form and

1. We give the contents of one of the many references quoted above. "Let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them." Exodus 25:8

2. "The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool; where is the house that ye build unto me, and where is the place of my rest."

3. "Howbeit, the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands."

features. We find confirmation also in the New Testament that God cannot be seen. The Gospel of John 1:18 has:

No man hath seen God at any time.

This proves that any being, visible to human eyes, cannot be God. If the word 'God' is used for a visible being one should not be misguided by it. It may be explained here that the word God used for any one but God would be a metaphor or a figurative use of the word.¹ There is no doubt that there may be some proper reason for using such words for beings other than God. The following example will make it more clear. We find such words used in the Pentateuch for the angels only because they demonstrate God's glory more than do any other creatures. Exodus 23:20 contains the following statement of God:

Behold I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice. Provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him.

Further in verse 23 it says:

For mine angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites and the Jebusites; and I will cut them off.

In the above statement the words, 'I send an angel before thee' and 'mine angel shall go before thee', are sufficient to prove that the moving post of the cloud in the day and the moving post of fire at night, guiding the Israelites in their way, was none but an angel² of God.

1. Our author here seems to explain that sometimes words are not used in their proper and usual meanings, only to convey some special message proper for the occasion. (Raazi).

2. At the time of Exodus God sent an angel that in the daytime moved in the form of cloud to shade the Israelites, at night it burnt like a fire. It was to guide them in their way.

Deifying words have been used for this angel¹ simply for the above reason.

The Attribution of Divinity to Other than God Himself in the Bible

This occurs profusely in the Bible in connection with angels, man, even Satan and inanimate things. In some places explanations have been given but at other times the metaphorical significance is so obvious that it leaves no room for doubt or misunderstanding. I would like to give some specific examples of this occurring in the Bible.²

We will not reproduce the whole text, but only the part directly related to the point in question. Genesis 17:1-4 says:

And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. And Abram fell on his face: and God talked with him, saying, 'As for me behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations.

Further in verses 7-9 we find:

And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in thy generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God.

Verses 15,18,19 and 22 of this chapter contain the words, "And God said unto Abram", "And Abram said unto God," etc. It is clear that the word 'God' is being used for the one talking to Abraham,

1. For example we find in Exodus 40:34: "Then a cloud covered the tent of the congregation and glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle." Here the words 'glory of the Lord' have been used referring to the glory of the angel.

2. The quotations are taken from the Oxford University Press edition of the King James Version.

while in fact, the talker was an angel of God which is confirmed by the last sentence (of verse 22) that is, "God went up from Abraham." Here the words Lord and God have been used for the angel, even the angel himself has used these words saying, 'I am Almighty God', 'I will be their God.'

Similarly these words are also used in chapter 18 of Genesis for the angel that appeared to Abraham along with two other angels who predicted the birth of Isaac, and informed him that the land of Lot would soon be destroyed. In this book the word God is used fourteen times for others. The same book at 28:10-17, describing the event of Jacob's departure from Beer-sheba, has:

And Jacob went out from Beer-sheba, and went toward Haran. And he lighted upon a certain place and tarried there all night, because the sun was set; and he took of the stones of that place, and put them for his pillows, and lay down in that place to sleep. And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And behold the Lord stood above it and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land wherein thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and the north and to the south: and in thee, and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. And behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of. And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, 'Surely the Lord is in this place; and I knew it not. And he was afraid and said, How dreadful is this place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.

Further the same book at 31:11-13 Jacob addresses his wives Leah and Rachel:

And the angel of God spake unto me in a dream, saying,

Jacob: And I said, Here am I. And he said, Lift up now thine eyes, and see, all the rams which leap upon the cattle are ringstraked, speckled and grisled: for I have seen all that Laban doeth unto thee. I am the God of Beth-el, where thou annointedst the pillar, and where thou vowedst a vow into me; now arise, get thee out from this land, and return unto the land of thy kindred.

Further in 32:9 of the same book it says:

And Jacob said, O God of my father Abraham, and God of my father Isaac, the Lord which saidst unto me, Return unto thy country, and to thy kindred.

Further in verse 12:

And thou saidst, I will surely do thee good, and make thy seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered for multitude.

And again in 35:1 of the same book:

And God said unto Jacob, Arise, go up to Beth-el, and dwell there: and make there an alter unto God, that appeared unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy brother. Then Jacob said unto his household, and to all that were with him, Put away the strange gods that are among you, and be clean, and change your garments: And let us arise, and go up to Beth-el; and I will make there an altar unto God, who answered me in the day of my distress, and was with me in the way which I went.

Describing the same event in detail in verse 6 of the same chapter it says:

So Jacob came to Luz, which is in the land of Canaan, that is, Beth-el, he and all the people that were with him, And he built there an altar, and called the place El-beth-el: because there God appeared unto him, when he fled from the face of

his brother.

Also we find in Genesis 48:3-4:

And Jacob said unto Joseph, God Almighty appeared unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me, And said unto me, Behold, I will make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, and I will of thee a multitude of people; and will give this land to thy seed after thee for an everlasting possession.

It should be noted that the one who had appeared to Jacob was in fact an angel as is explicitly understood from Genesis 31:11-13. The vow and covenant made by him was with the angel, and not directly with Almighty God, but we have seen in the above example that Jacob used the word God for this angel more than eighteen times. Even the angel himself used this word for himself.

Attribution of Divinity to Angels

We find another incredible and strange story about Jacob described in Genesis 32:24-30:

And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day. And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint, as he wrestled with him. And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me. And he said unto him. What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel;¹ for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men and hast prevailed. And Jacob asked him, and said, Tell me, I pray thee, thy name. And he said, Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name? And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel: for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.

1. Israel in Hebrew signifies wrestler with God.

It is obvious that the wrestler with Jacob was an angel referred to as God in the above verse. Firstly, because if we take the word God here in its real sense it would imply that the God of the Israelites is, God forbid, so weak and helpless that he could not overcome a man in a wrestling match which lasted for the whole night. Secondly, because the prophet Hosea made it clear that he was not God but an angel. It says in Hosea 12:3-4:

He took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with God: Yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed: he wept, and made supplication unto him: he found him in Beth-el, and there he spake with us.

In this statement also the word God is used twice for the angel. Besides, we find in Genesis 35:9-15:

And God appeared unto Jacob again, when he came out of Padan-aram, and blessed him. And God said unto him, Thy name is Jacob: thy name shall not be called any more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name; and he called his name Israel. And God said unto him, I am God Almighty: be fruitful and multiply: a nation, and a company of nation shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins; And the land which I gave Abraham and Isaac, to thee I will give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land. And God went up from him in the place where he talked with him. And Jacob set up a pillar in the place where he talked with him, even a pillar of stone; and he poured a drink offering thereon, and he poured oil thereon. And Jacob called the name of the place where God spoke with him Beth-el.

Here also the word God has been used five times for the angel who spoke with Jacob.

Also we find in Deuteronomy 1:30-33:

The Lord your God which goeth before you, he shall fight for you, according to all that he did for you in Egypt before your eyes; And in the wilderness, where thou hast seen how

that the Lord thy God bare thee, as a man doth bear his son, in all the way that ye went, until ye came into this place. Yet in this thing ye did not believe the Lord your God, Who went in the way before you, to search you out a place to pitch your tents in, in fire by night, to shew you by what way ye should go, and in a cloud by day.

The same use of the word 'God' is found repeatedly in the above passage. Again in Deuteronomy 31:3-8, we find this statement:

The Lord thy God, he will go over before thee, and he will destroy these nations from before thee....Be strong and of a good courage, fear not.... for the Lord thy God, he it is that doth go with thee; he will be with thee.

Here too the word 'God' has been used for an angel. In the book of Judges 13:22 this angel is described as having appeared to Manoah¹ and his wife:

And Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God.

While verses 3, 9, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 21 speak clearly of his being an angel and not God. Besides, the word 'God' is used for the angel of God also in Isaiah 6, I Samuel 3, Ezekiel 4 and 9, and in Amos 7.

The Attribution of Divinity to Men and Satan

Psalm 82:6 gives us a particularly clear example of this, saying:

I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the most High.

Here we find the word 'god' used for all people. Also in II Corinthians 4:3-4 we find:

But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In

1. Manoah is the father of Samson, the famous character of the Bible.

whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.

According to Protestant scholars, 'God of this world' in this passage signifies Satan.

By presenting the above examples from the Bible we intend to prove the fact that simply because the word 'God' has been used for someone or something else, that does not cause any sensible soul to think that those things have become God or sons of God.

Fifth Point

We have already shown under the third and the fourth point that metaphorical use of the word 'God' is found in abundance in the Bible. Now we intend to show that the use of metaphor in the Bible is not limited only to the occasions cited above. There are many other situations where metaphor and exaggeration are used quite freely.

The following examples will show it more clearly. Genesis 13:16 contains the words:

I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered.

Another example of exaggeration is found in 22:17 of the same book:

That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore.

A similar promise was made to Jacob that his generation would be multiplied in number as the dust of the earth, while in fact the generation of both Prophets together have never been increased in number equal to the number of grains found in a few grams of sand far from being equal to the dust of all the sea-shores of the earth.

Describing the land promised to the Israelites, Exodus 3:8 says:

Unto a land flowing with milk and honey.

While we all know that no such place exists on earth. Deuteronomy chapter 1 contains the following statement:

The cities are great and walled up to heaven.¹

And in chapter 9 we read:

To possess nations greater and mightier than thyself, cities great and fenced up to heaven.²

Psalms 78:65-66 says:

Then the Lord awaked as one out of sleep, and like a mighty man that shouteth by reason of wine, And he smote his enemies in the hinder parts; he put them to a perpetual reproach.

Psalms 104:3 contains this eulogy to God:

Who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters: who maketh the clouds his chariot: who walketh upon the wings of the wind.

The writings of the evangelist John are full of metaphors, similes, hyperboles and exaggerations. You will hardly find a sentence that does not require interpretation. Those who have read his Gospel, his Epistles and his Revelation are well acquainted with this characteristic of John. For example he starts chapter 12 of Revelation with this description:

And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon

1. Deut. 1:28.

2. Deut. 9:1.

her head a crown of twelve stars; And she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered. And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born. And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God and to his throne. And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days.

And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought, and his angels, And prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven.

The ludicrous description above seems a meaningless outpouring of a madman until some sensible explanation can be found for it which is certainly not easy in this case. The Judaeo-Christian scholars do try to forward some explanations for such statements and do admit the presence of exaggeration and hyperbole in the holy scriptures. The author of *Murshid at-Talibeen* said in section 3 of his book:

As far as the style of the sacred books is concerned, it is full of innumerable and complicated metaphors, particularly the Old Testament.

Further he has said:

And the style of the New Testament is also highly metaphorical, particularly the events of our Saviour. For this reason many wrong notions and ideas have spread, as some Christian teachers have tried to provide such passages with word for word explanations. Here are some examples to show

that word for word explanation for metaphorical passages is not admissible. In Christ's statement about King Herod: "Go ye, tell that fox,"¹ obviously, the word 'fox' refers to the cruel and deceitful king, since this animal is known for being cruel and deceitful. Similarly our Lord said to the Jews:

I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.¹

but the Jews took this passage in its literal sense and asked how it was possible for him to offer them his own flesh to eat, not realizing that it referred to the sacrifice of Christ offering himself as atonement for the sins of the whole world. Our Saviour also said on the occasion of the Eucharist about the bread that, 'It is my body' and about the drink that, 'It is the blood of my covenant'.

Then from the twelfth century Roman Catholics started to interpret it in another sense, in contradiction to the statements of the sacred books, and invented the teaching of the transubstantiation, by which the bread and drink would be transformed into the body and blood of Christ. Whereas we say that the bread and wine still retain their substance and do not change at all. The correct explanation of the statement of our Lord is that the bread is like the body of the Christ and wine is like his blood.

This admission is quite clear and unambiguous, but he has interpreted Christ's statement to refute the belief of the Catholics that the bread and drink are really transformed in the body and blood of Christ, while in fact, the apparent meanings of the passage are exactly what the Catholics have understood. Christ's statement is this:

And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat;

1. John 6:51.

1. See Luke 13:32.

this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.¹

The Catholics, who believe in the transformation of the bread into the body of Christ, were in the majority before the appearance of the Protestant movement. The number of people of this sect is still greater all over the world.

Since this belief of transubstantiation is not correct, in the opinion of the Protestants, on the grounds that it is not acceptable to human reason and commonsense, the concept of trinity should similarly be rejected on the same grounds, because universally acknowledged rational arguments bear witness against it, though some vague indications to this concept may be found in some biblical statements. It may be contended that the fact that this belief is now the belief of millions of sensible Christians, is, in itself, an argument for its being a believable concept. In answer to this contention we may remind them that the millions of Roman Catholics who still hold the belief of transubstantiation are equally sensible and are greater in number than the Protestants. They still firmly believe in the actual transformation of the bread into the body of Christ. This invalidates the Protestant contention. Now we will show that the sacrament of the Eucharist, as believed by the Catholics, is totally irrational and something that is totally unacceptable to human reason.

First Argument

The Roman Catholic Church claims that the wine and bread physically change into the blood and body of Christ and become, in a real sense, Christ himself. This bread, when transformed into Christ, must, therefore, be physically transformed into human flesh. It is clear, however, that the bread retains all its properties and anyone seeing

1. Matthew 26:26-27.

and touching it finds nothing but bread, and if this bread is left for some time it decays and decomposes like any other bread. It will not show any of the changes that occur when the human body decomposes.

Second Argument

The presence of Christ, with his divine character, at thousands of places in one and the same time may be possible in Christian thought but it is not compatible with his human character. Because being fully human he was like other human beings, feeling hunger, eating, drinking, and sleeping as all other men do. Being human he was even afraid of the Jews and fled from them. It is, therefore, logically impossible that Christ possessing a single human form could be present physically at innumerable places at the same time.¹

Third Argument

If we assume that the thousands of priests are capable of instant consecration, making the bread offered by them instantly turn into the body of the same Christ who was born of the Virgin Mary at their recitation, it leaves us with two possibilities: either every one of these Christs is exactly and precisely the same real Christ born of the Virgin Mary, or that every one of them is other than the real Christ.

Fourth Argument

Now when the bread has turned into the body of Christ in the hands of the priest, he breaks it into many small pieces. This again presents two possibilities, either Christ is also divided into an equal number of small pieces or each piece again turns into a complete and perfect Christ. According to the former the eater of one piece would not be considered as having eaten the whole of Christ; and according

1. The Christians believe that wherever in the world the ceremony of Eucharist is performed, Christ physically makes himself present at that place.

to the latter, you will have to believe in the presence of an army of Christs.

Fifth Argument

The event of the Lord's supper that took place a little before the 'crucifixion' served the purpose of the sacrifice that was later supposed to have been achieved by putting Jesus on the cross and crucifying him. It was quite unnecessary that he should be crucified by the Jews after having already sacrificed himself. Because, according to Christian thought, the only purpose of Christ coming in the world was to sacrifice himself for the redemption of the world. He had not come to suffer again and again for this purpose, as is understood from the last passage of Hebrews chapter 9.¹

Sixth Argument

If the Christian claim is taken as correct, it would make the Christians more cruel to Christ than the Jews as they persecuted Christ only once and left him² while the Christians day by day persecute Christ, slay him and eat and drink his flesh and blood. If the Jews can be condemned and cursed for crucifying Christ once what should be the fate of those who kill and slay Christ a number of times every day and do not leave him alone after this but eat his flesh and drink his blood? What can be said of those who do not hesitate to eat their god? If their god cannot save himself from their clutches who on earth will be safe from them?

Seventh Argument

Luke 22:19 contains the following statement of Christ with regard

1. "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him, shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

2. The Christian Church, after the pact of friendship with the Jews in 1964, clearly declared that the Jews had nothing to do with the killing of Christ. This declaration stands in clear contradiction with what the Bible says and shows the scant respect they give to the Bible.

to the institution of Eucharist:

This do in remembrance of me.

If this supper was in itself a sacrifice, then it cannot have been a memorial or a remembrance, as nothing can be a remembrance of itself.

People who accept such superstitions as a bread turning into Christ are all the more liable to become a prey to greater superstitions in divine matters such as the concept of God and other matters related to reason. We contend that if all these sensible followers can agree on a belief which is absolutely rejected by logic and commonsense, either in blind pursuance of their ancestors or for some other reason, it should not be come as a surprise to us that the Protestants and Catholics have together agreed on the trinity which is more absurd and more in contradiction with human reason.

There are a large number of people, a greater number, in fact, than the Catholics, who are called heretics because they have abandoned the Christian faith simply because they found too many institutions and beliefs of the Christian faith unacceptable to human reason. They refused to accept what is unacceptable. Their books are full of arguments to support their thought. Moreover, there is another sect called Unitarians who also have rejected the institution of the Eucharist. The Jews and the Muslims also refute and reject this mythological and even absurd teaching.

Sixth Point: Ambiguity in the Statements of Christ

There are innumerable examples of ambiguity found in the statements of Christ. So much so that his disciples and close friends could not understand his message until Jesus himself had elucidated it. The statements explained by Jesus have definitely been understood but many other statements that were not explained by him still remain obscure and ambiguous except some of them that were understood with great effort after a long time. There are many examples of this in the New Testament of which we will mention only a few.

First Example

Chapter 2 of the Gospel of John, describing the event of some Jews who asked Christ for some signs, reports the following reply of Jesus to the Jews:

Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.¹

In this example even the disciples of Jesus could not understand the significance of the above statement until the resurrection of Christ let alone it being understood by the Jews.

Second Example

Jesus said to Nicodemus:²

Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.³

Nicodemus not understanding Jesus, answered:

How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?

Jesus tried to make him understand the second time, but he still did not understand, then Jesus said to him:

1. John 2:19-22.

2. Nicodemus was a ruler of the Jews, a Pharisee, who came to Jesus and asked some questions. Jesus addressed him and said many things that he could not understand.

3. John 3:3.

Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?¹

Third Example

Christ, addressing the Jews, said:

I am that bread of life.... This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die...² and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, ... Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me....

Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this, said, This is a hard saying; who can hear it?

...From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.

This time the Jews did not understand Jesus and even his disciples found it to be hard and complicated with the result that many of his disciples abandoned him.

Fourth Example

The Gospel of John 8:21-22 has:

Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins: Whither I go, ye

1. John 3:10

2. The author has selected sentences from a long description given by John and can be found in John 6 from verse 48 onwards.

cannot come. Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself? because he saith, Whither I go, ye cannot come.

Fifth Example

John 8:51-52 says:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death. Then said the Jews unto him, Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death.

Here, too, the Jews could not understand the statement of Jesus, rather they accused him of being possessed by the devil.

Sixth Example

We read in John 11:11-14:

And after that he saith unto them, Our friend Lazarus¹ sleepeth; but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep. Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well. Howbeit Jesus spake of his death: but they thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep. Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead.

Here we see that the disciples did not understand him until he explained what he had meant.

Seventh Example

Matthew 16:6-12 contains the following statement:

Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. And they rea-

1. Lazarus was the man who was raised from the dead by Jesus with the grace of God.

soned among themselves, saying, It is because we have taken no bread. Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread?... How is it that ye do understand that I spake it not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of the bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

Similarly here the disciples could not understand what Jesus said to them until he explained it to them.

Eighth Example

Under the description of the maid that was raised from the dead we find this statement in Luke 8:52-53:

And all wept and bewailed her: but he said, Weep not; she is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead.

Jesus, in this example, was laughed at, as no one could understand what he meant.

Ninth Example

We find the following address of Jesus to his disciples in Luke 9:44-45:

Let these sayings sink down into your ears: for the Son of man shall be delivered into the hands of men, But they understood not this saying, and it was hid from them, that they perceived it not: and they feared to ask of that saying.

The disciples again could not understand Jesus in the above example.

The following statement appears in Luke 18:31-34:

Then he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished. For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on: And they shall scourge him, and put him to death: and the third day he shall rise again. And they understood none of these things: and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken.

On this occasion the disciples did not understand this saying even though it was the second time that they had been told about it. Apparently the above statement had no ambiguity in it. Perhaps the reason for their not understanding this saying was that they had learnt from the Jews that Christ would be a great king. Now at the appearance of Christ when they embraced his faith, they were looking forward to the time when they would sit on the royal throne with Christ. They had firm belief in this because Christ himself had promised them that they would sit on twelve thrones, and each of them would rule over the people of one tribe of the Israelites. They thought the kingdom promised by him was the kingdom of this world, as indicated by the literal sense of Christ's words. Now the above saying was totally against their expectations and belief. We are going to show, in the next pages, that the disciples of Jesus truly had such expectations.

Everlasting Doubt Concerning Some Precepts

Due to the ambiguity of some of Christ's statements his disciples were left in everlasting uncertainty with regard to some matters related to faith and they were unable to remove this doubt as long as they lived. For instance, they believed that John the Baptist would not die until the Day of Resurrection and they firmly believed that the Day of Resurrection would come in their lifetime. We have discussed these

two matters in detail earlier in the book.

It is established that the actual words of Christ are not found in any of the Gospels. The Gospels only contain a translation of what the narrators or reporters thought Christ had said. We have produced undeniable evidence to prove that there is no trace of the existence of the original Evangel. All that we have is a translation and that, too, is without any sign or indication of the translator. There is no convincing proof, either, that other books which are ascribed to various authors really were written by these authors. We have already shown that these books have undergone innumerable alterations, and have been badly distorted. We have also proved that believing Christians have distorted these texts for religious purposes, that is, either for supporting some commonly believed precept or for removing certain objections from it.

We have also shown in earlier pages that any texts concerning the precept of trinity have also been distorted and changed. The following lines were added to the text of chapter 5 of the First Epistle of John:

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost.¹

Similarly some words were added to the text of chapter 1 of Matthew while a complete verse was omitted from chapter 22 of Luke.

The Seventh Point: Impossibility of the Possibles

Sometimes human reason is not able to have access to the full significance of certain things but at the same time it does not discard them as an impossibilities. Their existence is accepted as being possible. All such things, therefore, are considered to lie in the category of the possible.

Similarly sometimes human reason, on the basis of some rational argument or merely on apparent evidence, decides that something is

1. I John 5:7.

impossible. The existence of all such things are categorised as impossibilities. Obviously each of them is explicitly different from the other. Similarly two things contradictory to each other cannot exist together. Likewise it is not logically possible for one thing to be devoid of both the qualities of possibility and impossibility. For example, one cannot be human and non-human at the same time. For instance if Zayd is not non-human he must be human, or if a stone is not human it must be non-human. Anything claimed against these logical rules would be considered absurd and impossible by every sensible person throughout the world. In the same way singularity and plurality cannot be found in one thing at the same time. Similarly two opposites cannot exist together at the same time. For instance, light and darkness, blackness and whiteness, warmth and coldness, wetness and dryness, visibility and invisibility, motion and immobility, cannot exist together. This is so obvious that human reason would instantly decide against it.

The Eighth Point: What To Do With Counteracting Arguments

There are situations when we are faced with counteracting arguments between the two ideas. In such cases if we are unable to prefer one over the other, both have to be discarded, otherwise some convincing explanation must be found for both. However it is essential that this explanation must not be a rational impossibility. For example the verse speaking of God's physical form and features contradict or counteract the verses that speak of God as being free from physical shape and form. It is therefore essential to interpret these verses so as to remove the apparent contradiction from them. At the same time it is essential that this interpretation should not define God as being physical and non-physical at the same time, because such an interpretation would be a rational impossibility and unacceptable to human reason and would not remove the contradiction from the statements.

The Ninth Point: Three Cannot Be One

Number, in itself, is not self-existent. It always exists causatively.

Philosophically speaking it is accidental. Every number therefore is an entity different from others. One is different from two, and three etc. Anything that is more than one, cannot be considered to be one. Any claim therefore, to the presence of singularity and plurality in one thing at the same time has to be rejected by human reason as being absurd and irrational.

The Tenth Point: Real Unity and Trinity Together

From our view point there would nothing objectionable if the Christians did not claim that the trinity and unity of God was real and factual, and that three were actually one and one actually three. If they claimed that unity existed in reality while the trinity existed only figuratively, in that case we would agree with them and have no contention with them. But they claim their gods to be three and to be one at the same time as is more than evident from the books of Protestant scholars. The author of *Meezan al Haqq* said in his book *Hall-al-Ishkal*:

The Christians believe in trinity and unity in the real sense of the words.

The Eleventh Point: Different Interpretations of Trinity

The great Muslim scholar Maqrizi,¹ describing contemporary Christians said in his book *Al-Khitat*:

The Christians are divided into many sects: Melchites,² Nestorians,³ Jacobites,⁴ the Bodhanians⁵ and the Maronites

1. Taqiuddin Ahmad al-Maqrizi, born in 1364 AH, was a great historian. His work on Egypt entitled *Al-Khitat* is a valuable document.

2. Melchites: They are related to the "king" of Rome. (See *Al-Milal waṇ Nahah* by Shahrastani, vol.2 pages 39) They are an Eastern sect of Monophysites.

3. Nestorians: They are the followers of Patrick Nestorius, a well-known philosopher of the fifth century. He said that the one born of Mary was the Christ, and the ever-existent Son born of God had incarnated into Christ like the light of the sun is reflected in a mirror. Therefore the divine Christ and human Christ are separate entities. Therefore, Christ's prostration to God is not admissible. The Council of Ephesus

who lived near Harran.

He further said:

The Melchites, Nestorians and Jacobites all believe that God is three persons and that the three persons are one, that is in their pre-existent essence. This means that the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost combined together are one God.

Again he said:

They claim that the Son was united with a born son, the uniter and the united together became Christ, and this Christ is the Lord and God of the people. Now there is disagreement among them regarding the nature of this Unity. Some Christians say that the essence of divinity and the essence of humanity were united together, and this unity did not cancel the essence of the other. Christ is both, the Lord God and the son of Mary who remained in her womb and was given birth by her and who was crucified.

Some other Christians claim that after being united they became two separate essences, one human and the other divine, and his death and crucifixion are related to his human aspect and not to his divine person. Similarly his birth is related to his former person. They say that Christ as a whole is worthy of worship and Lord God. Some

declared Nestorius an infidel. As a result there was great disagreement and opposition among the Christians for a long time. Nestorius died in 451. Nestorians, after that, lived in Turkey, Syria and in some deserted parts of Iran. Their Churches are usually dark and in bad shape. (*Britannica* under the entry Nestorians vol.16 pages 246, 247. *Al-Milal wan Nihal* vol.2 pages 44,45 Cairo, *Al-Khitat* by Maqrizi vol.3 page 389.)

3. Jacobites. This sect is said to follow the views of James Baradai, who was born in about 500. He preached that, as Christ was divine and human at the same time, he was likewise made of two hypostases. This was against the common belief of Christians since they believed that Christ possessed divinity and humanity but not two hypostases in himself. The sect later claimed that Christ was in fact the Godhead. *Britannica* vol:12 page 859, *Shahristani* vol:2 page 48. *Ibn Khaldun* vol.1, page 225 and *Ibn Hazm* vol.1 page 49.

4. Bodhanians: Maqrizi has said that they were Christians while *Shahristani* said they were Jews.

Christians think that the human and divine essences were united but that the divine essence is inseparable, while others claim that the hypostasis of the son was incarnated into the body and was united with it. Others think that this unity is only an appearance like writing on wax or a reflection in a mirror. The Melchites say that God is the name of three meanings. They believe in one in three and three in one. The Jacobites claim that God was One and self-existent, non physical, then later he became physical and human. The Maronites, on the other hand, hold that God is One. Christ is not his physical son but out of his kindness, love and grace he called him his Son, as Abraham was called the friend of God. In short they have great differences in this matter.

The above differences with regard to the interpretation of that trinity among Christians are so great and serious and so contradictory to each other that no definite conclusion can be arrived at. The Protestants, realising this absurdity of the concept of union, rebelled against the opinion of their elders and took refuge in keeping silent on this matter.

Twelfth Point: The Trinity Did Not Exist Before

✓ The previous peoples right from Adam to Moses had no concept of Trinity. Some of the verses from Genesis often quoted in its support are of no avail as trinitarian interpretations of these verses are strange and far removed from the text.

The most prominent among those verses is Genesis 1:26 which is frequently quoted by the Christians. It says:

And God said, let us make man in our image.

In this verse God has used first person plural for himself. The Christians deduce from it that God was not one and alone at the time of the creation. Augustine said in his book:

Had the father been alone without the son, he would have not used the first person plural.

Even Paul used this person for himself (See I Corinthians 3:4 and 8:1) Besides, if this plural has to be taken in its literal sense what would happen to those first person singulars used for God that are found profusely throughout the books of the Bible? Why and on what ground are they not taken in their literal sense? If they contend that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, united together are one, the use of plural for himself should not be allowed. It is rationally impossible that the singular and plural be used in a literal sense for the same person. In case they contend that 'We' has been used in a literal sense while 'I' is used metaphorically, it would mean that the actual person 'We' for God is used in the whole Bible only two or three times, while figurative use of the singular person 'I' is used at thousands of places. It is strange that the word 'I' used in a thousand places is not to be taken literally and is interpreted as being figurative and the plural 'We' is taken to represent the reality and yet is rarely used, in two or three places only.

Apart from this it has now been confirmed through undeniable arguments that the verses of Genesis, containing the word 'We' for God have been distorted in their meanings. Jewish scholars and commentators have unveiled this fact extensively. The Muslim scholar Maulana Nasiruddin has proved through grammatical arguments that the Hebrew word '*Mamnu*' has been wrongly translated as 'We' in these verses.

Our present contention is that none of the verses proves that the previous people ever believed in the concept of trinity. Any common reader of the present Pentateuch fully knows that this precept did not exist in the time of Moses or in the subsequent times of his followers.

Even John the Baptist was not certain that Jesus was really the Christ, promised by God, as is plainly understood from chapter 11 of Matthew, where we read that John sent two of his disciples to Christ to ask if he was the Christ that was to come or should they wait for some other.

Now if Christ is taken to be God Incarnate, it makes John the Baptist an infidel, as having any doubt about God is infidelity. It is obviously unimaginable that the Prophet John would not have recog-

nised his God, when, according to the witness of Christ, he was superior to all other Prophets. This is understood from the same chapter of Matthew:

Among them that are born of woman, there has not risen greater than John the Baptist.¹

When John the Baptist, who is also the contemporary of Christ, could not recognise him as God, how could prior Prophets have recognised him?

Also all Jewish scholars, right from the time of Moses up to these days, do not accept this precept, it being obvious that God and His attributes are self-existent and immutable, pre-existent and eternal. If the trinity was in truth the true nature of the Divine Reality it would have been necessary for all other Prophets and Moses to have explained in clear terms the reality of tritheism. It would be incredibly strange that the law of Moses, which was followed by many of the Prophets up to the time of Christ, should be absolutely silent on a matter of so great an importance and which was so basic to religion to the extent that, according to the trinitarians, no salvation is possible without believing in it! Even more surprising and incredible is the fact that Jesus himself did not speak of this belief before his ascension to heaven. For instance he would surely have said that God is of three persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and that the second person of the Son was united with his body and that it was beyond their understanding to grasp the full significance of the character of this unity. In fact, there is not a single statement of Jesus to that effect, except some unacceptable and dubious remarks. The author of *Meezan al-Haqq* said in his book *Miftah al-Asrar* :

If you raise the objection as to why Christ himself did not express his deistic character saying clearly that he was God without partners.....

Answering this objection he has given a lengthy, ambiguous and

1. Matt. 11:11.

obscure explanation that we will refrain from quoting here as it does not serve any purpose. However he said at the end:

The people were not able to understand the nature of this unity and the actual relation of the three persons. Because of this, had Christ described it in clear terms, people would have misunderstood him to be God in his human capacity, and this would have certainly been wrong. This is one of the matters of which Christ said to his disciples, "I have yet many things to say unto you but you cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth, for he shall not speak and show you things to come."

He also said:

Many times the leaders of the Jews sought to arrest him and to stone him to death. In spite of the fact that he did not clearly express his deification, he used to refer to his being God only vaguely.

There are two excuses suggested by this author. Firstly people would not be able to understand the significance of this matter before the ascension of Jesus. Secondly, Jesus did not express his godhood out of fear of the Jews. Both excuses are, in fact, weak and imbecilic. First because people are equally unable to understand and to explain the riddle of trinity even after the ascension of Jesus. None of the Christian scholars up to this day has been able to understand the nature of the unity of the three in one. Whatever has been said in this connection is all based on personal suppositions and assumptions. The Protestants, therefore, have resorted to silence. The above author also has admitted that this matter is a mystery and cannot be defined in words.

The second excuse is also not acceptable because if the only objective of Christ's coming into this world was to atone for the sins of the people of this world by sacrificing his life, Christ would certainly have known that he was going to be crucified by the Jews. He would also have known the time of crucifixion. This being the case, it would

have been unnecessary and unimaginable for him not to have clearly explained his 'divine nature' out of fear of the Jews. It is incredible that the Creator of the heavens and the earth, having absolute power over his will, should fear his creatures, especially the Jews who are considered to be weak and helpless in this world. Is it believable that out of fear for such people he should have abstained from speaking a truth that was so basic for eternal salvation when Prophets like Jeremiah, Isaiah and John the Baptist willingly faced the worst kind of persecution, some even giving up their lives for the sake of the truth?

We find it even more incredible that Christ should have feared the Jews in explaining this matter when he was so strict and so unafraid of the Jews that he severely abused them for not acting upon his injunctions. The following statement is one of such examples. He said when addressing the scribes and Pharisees:

Woe unto you, ye blind guides.....Woe unto you, ye fools and blind.....Thou blind Pharisee.....Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?

It is clear from chapter 23 of Matthew and chapter 11 of Luke that Christ used to disclose their evil and weakness openly to the people without a trace of fear. Keeping this in view how one can imagine that he should not declare and explain a belief of so great an importance that human salvation depended on it. The Prophet Jesus (peace be on him) was beyond such weakness.

The Trinity on Trial

First Argument

As trinity and unity are taken by the Christians in their literal sense, the existence of trinity therefore would essentially prove plurality as we discussed under the ninth point in our introduction to this section. The presence of plurality essentially precludes singularity. Otherwise it would mean two opposites co-existing which is a rational

impossibility. Someone who believes in the trinity cannot, therefore, be called a believer in unity.

The Christian contention that the unity of three and one are only logically possible in the case of God is childish and unsupported by any argument. Once it is confirmed that two things are inherently opposite to each other, or intrinsically contradictory to one another, both of them obviously cannot exist in one object at the same time. This is because absolute 'one' is not compound and made of other parts. It is absolute and without parts, while contrary to it three is a collection of three separate 'ones'. Now if both of them are assumed to be found together in one object, it would imperatively require that the part is a whole and the whole is a part, this in turn would pre-require that God is made of parts that are infinite. Only in this case could the parts and the whole be considered to have one reality. This assumption, therefore stands in contradiction to human reason. This would also require that one is a third of its entity, and three is a third of one.

Second Argument

If we assume, as is claimed by the Christians, that God is composed of three persons, each being distinctive in a real sense from each other, it would not only prove a plurality of gods, but also would essentially demand that God cannot exist as an absolute reality, but only relatively as a compound. The parts of a compound are all in need of one another. A stone simply laid beside man does not imply that man and stone have been united together in a compound, and it is obvious that gods do not have need of one another for their existence, only created beings are in need of others for their being. Each part is evidently a separate entity from the whole. In this way the whole would essentially be dependent on its part. Certainly God can not be supposed to be dependent on others for His existence.

Third Argument

The presence of three distinctive persons in God, in a real sense,

raises another question. Either this distinction is with a quality of perfection, in this case all the persons would not possess all the perfection equally, which is against the common belief of the Christians who claim that each person of the trinity is attributed with all perfection; or this distinction is with a quality of imperfection, in this case each person would be attributed with an imperfection, and God must be free from any defects or imperfection.

Fourth Argument

A unity between the divine essence and a human essence would essentially demand that the person of the son should be finite and limited. Such a thing cannot be self-existent. It would always exist through a creator. This necessitates that the second person, the Son, should be created; and a created thing cannot be supposed to be God the Creator.

Fifth Argument

The three persons, distinct from each other in a real sense would require that the thing making distinction between them should be something that is not self-existent, as it would be commonly possessed by all the three persons. In other words it would be something other than the person. Therefore each person would be a compound of two persons and obviously each compound needs its components for its existence. It would therefore prove that each of the three persons is dependent on the other two for his existence.

Sixth Argument

The view of the Jacobites is evidently irrational hence unacceptable, because their view of trinity would require the created existence of God Who is Pre- and Self-existent. It would also necessitate God's presence in a physical and material form.¹

1. The Jacobites claimed that the essence and reality of God had been changed and had become transformed into humanity.

The other views of the Christians with regard to the trinity are also refuted for the following reasons.

If the unity of God and man was assumed to be through incarnation it would be rejected for three reasons. Firstly because this incarnation would either be of the kind that is found in a rose and its fragrance, seed and oil etc. This is impossible because it would only be possible only if the hypostatic person of the Son was assumed to be physical, but the Christians believe him to be metaphysical and say that he has no body. If the incarnation were like a colour found in a body, this is also wrong as it would necessitate the presence of the body for the existence of the colour. Or if it is of the kind that is found between things and their properties, it would also make them interdependent on each other. Now when all the forms of incarnation are not possible the belief in the incarnational concept is rationally unacceptable.

Secondly, if we keep aside the nature of incarnation and assume that the Son incarnated into the body of Christ, this would not be possible if we assume that prior to the existence of this body the Son also did not exist, the Son would have a created existence, and conversely if we assume that the body also existed with the existence of the Son, it would prove that body too is self-existent which is again a rational impossibility. So if we assume that the son incarnated into the body of Christ, this incarnation would be an addition to his person that again calls for its being something that came into being causatively which again precludes his being self-existent.

Thirdly, the incarnation of the Son in the body of Christ leaves us with two possibilities: either the Son still remains with the Godhead or he leaves him. In the former case the presence of a person in two places at the same time is claimed and that is not possible, and in the latter case it would demand absence of the Son from the Godhead. This would negate the existence of Godhead Himself as the absence of the part essentially proves the absence of the whole.

Now if they claim that this unity of Christ and the second person of the trinity, the Son, happens without incarnation then that would mean the presence of two and not one. Therefore they could not be

called united. And if both cease to be present, a third being would come into existence which also would negate the unity. It would be called the non-existence of the two and the new existence of the third. If one continues to exist and the other ceases to exist, the unity between existent and non-existent would be impossible. This proves that unity of the Son and the body of Christ is rationally impossible.

Those who believe that this unity is like the writing on the wax or like a reflection in the mirror are in no better position. This is not a sound basis for unity either, rather it proves contrary to it, because the writing and reflection are two separate entities. As the man and his reflection in the mirror are two separate beings. At the most it proves that man's reflection in the mirror resembles him more than any other man does.

The Seventh Argument

With regards to the Eucharist, the Protestants usually laugh at the Catholics for their belief in the transformation of bread into the body of Christ on the ground that it is contrary to the human sense perfection. They equally deserve this mockery because every one who has seen Christ has seen him in human form only. Their view with regard to the unity of Christ with the Son is equally laughable.

Three Converts to Christianity

It is said that three men converted to Christianity. The priest taught them the basics of the Christian faith especially the doctrine of trinity. Once a friend of the priest came to see him. He asked the priest if he had properly educated the converts in the basic principles of faith. The priest called the converts to his presence and asked his friend to test their knowledge. He asked one of the converts about the trinity. He answered that he had have been taught that there are three gods. One that is in heaven, another that was born of Mary, and a third that descended on the second god in the form of a dove when he was thirty years old.¹

1. That is, the Spirit which according to Matthew 3:16 descended on the Christ when he was thirty years old.

The priest was angry with him and asked the second convert to answer the same question. He said that there were three gods. One of them was killed by the Jews so now there were only two gods. The priest admonished him on his ignorance and put the same question to the third convert. He was the most intelligent of the three. He answered that by the grace of the Lord he had learnt all that was taught to him. He said that one is three, and three are one. One of them was crucified and because of their unity the other two also died. Now there is no God. Otherwise the unity of the gods would have been negated.

This trinitarian concept, in fact, is a riddle so complicated that the scholars and the laymen are equally unable to fathom its significance. The scholars admit that they are unable to comprehend and to interpret this doctrine. Imam Fakhruddin Raazi has said under his comments of the Qur'anic chapter *Al-Nisa'*:

The Christian faith is unintelligible.¹

Further he said:

There is nothing more misguided and evidently irrational than the Christian faith.

Interpretation of Biblical Verses

It having been rationally proved through undeniable arguments that the trinity cannot exist, some interpretation must be found for those statements which apparently indicate it.

There are four possibilities. Either we should follow the rational and textual arguments; or we should reject the rational and textual arguments; or we should prefer the texts over reason and logic; or we should prefer reason and logic over the text.

The first is not practicable in Christianity as it would necessitate that one thing should be possible and impossible at the same time.² The second is also not possible as it would negate all our acts and

1. See page 346 of vol. 3 of *Tafseer-e-Kabeer*.

2. Because the arguments of one kind are opposite and contradictory to the other.

beliefs. The third possibility is also out of question because all the textual evidence is dependent on rational evidence of the existence of God and on the fact that God really sent His prophets etc. Therefore rejecting rational evidence would call for the rejection of all the textual evidence. This means then that we should acknowledge the evidence of reason and interpret the textual evidence to remove any contradictions it may present to rational argument.

Interpretation of the text has been a usual practice among Judaeo-Christian scholars. They interpret the verses that speak of God's physical form and features. Similarly they interpret many of those verses that seem to speak of God as being limited to space. We are really surprised at the Catholics who reject the clear bounds of human reason and claim that bread and wine, that have come into being centuries after the ascension of Christ, are suddenly transubstantiated into the flesh and blood of Christ and then worship them and prostrate before them. They also cast aside all the demands of human reason and reject very obvious rational arguments with regard to the concept of trinity versus unity and insist that the two can exist together in one person at the same time.

We are faced with two kinds of excessive and contradictory behaviour on the part of the Christians. On the one hand their exuberant and excessive respect for Christ does not stop them making a man into a God and on the other hand, they do not hesitate to attribute shameful acts to him and to his ancestors. They believe that Christ went down into hell after his death, remaining there for three days. Similarly they claim that the prophets David, Solomon and Christ's ancestors are the descendants of Pharez¹ who was an illegitimate son of Tamar. Similarly they believe that the Prophet David, who is the forefather of Christ, committed fornication with the wife of Uriah.² They also claim that the Prophet Solomon became an apostate and worshipped idols in his later years.³

We have discussed all these examples earlier in detail.

1. Genesis 38:19-30.

2. II Samuel 11:4.

3. I Kings 11: 4-9.

Sale's Admission and His Will

The renowned orientalist and great scholar, Sale, whose translation of the Qur'an is quite popular, left a written advice in the form of a will for the Christians which we reproduce below from his translation printed in 1836. He said:

Firstly, do not be hard with the Muslims; secondly, do not preach doctrines that are openly irrational because the Muslims cannot be overcome in these matters. For example idol worship, the institution of Eucharist, etc., are matters that are most resisted by the Muslims and the church has no chance of convincing them by teaching these doctrines.¹

Sale has admitted in clear terms that all the doctrines leading to idol worship and the Eucharist are irrational and logically unacceptable. In fact, all the believers in these doctrines do undoubtedly associate with God. May God guide them to the right Path.

The Trinity Refuted by Christ Himself

We intend to reproduce in this section those statements of Christ which implicitly or explicitly refute the doctrine of trinity.

First Statement

The Gospel of John 17:3 contains the following statement. Jesus said, making supplication to God:

And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

The above statement has no other meaning except that the secret of eternal life is that man should believe in Allah as being the only true God and in Jesus as his Messenger. This statement does not say that eternal life lies in believing God to be a hypostatic union of three per-

1. As we could not find the edition of this translation referred to by the author. I have faithfully translated the contents from Urdu. (Raazi).

sons who are distinct from one another, and that Jesus is fully human and fully divine at the same time or that he is God incarnate. This statement was made by him during his supplication to God which precludes any assumption that he might have said it out of fear of the Jews. If belief in the trinity was necessary for eternal salvation he must have expressed it here being alone and having none to fear.

When it is confirmed, as it is here, that eternal life resides in belief in the true unity of God and in belief in the prophethood of Christ, it follows that anything really opposite to this belief must be the cause of eternal death. Christ being sent by God essentially proves him to be other than God.

The Muslims, on the contrary, are the possessors of this eternal life for believing in the only true God while other nations who indulge in idol worship like Magians, Hindus and Chinese associaters are deprived of it, as are the trinitarians for not having belief in the true unity of God. The Jews are deprived of it for not believing in Jesus as being sent by God.

Second Statement

The Gospel of Mark 12:28-34 says:

And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he: And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices.

And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.

The above two injunctions are also described in Matthew chapter 22 in similar words and at the end it says:

On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.¹

We understand from the above the doctrine that was expressed and elucidated by all the Prophets in their books and by Moses in the Torah: that the only way to the kingdom of God is to believe that Allah is one and there is no God but He. Had belief in the trinity been essential for eternal salvation it would have been expressed and elucidated by all the prophets, and Jesus must have said something to the effect that God consists of three persons, each person being distinct from one another in real sense. The absence of such indications in the sacred books is enough to prove the falsity of this irrational doctrine.

Some vague and ambiguous deductions made by Christians from the books of some Prophets are not valid as they are so cryptic and equivocal that they cannot be accepted in the face of the simple and explicit statement quoted above. The following statements are quite clear in their purport.

Deuteronomy 4:35 contains:

That thou mightest know that the Lord he is God; there is none else beside him.

Further in verse 39 it says:

Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: there is none else.

Again in Deuteronomy 6:4-5:

1. Matt. 22:40.

Hear, O Israel : The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.

The Book of Isaiah 45:5-6 contains:

I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the Lord, and there is none else.

The same book 46:9 has:

For I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me.

All the above verses announce in simple and plain words that the people of the east and the west are required to believe essentially that:

There is no God but Allah.

The translator of the Arabic version of the Bible printed in 1811 distorted Christ's statement by changing the first person into the second person.¹ Christ's statement was "The Lord our God is one Lord", this has been changed into, "The Lord thy God is one Lord". This seems to have been deliberately changed as the first person used in the first instance refutes any possibility of godhood for Jesus while the use of the second person does not necessarily refute it.

Third Statement

The Gospel of Mark 13:32 contains this statement:

But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

This statement again speaks clearly of the falsehood of the trinity,

1. That is, the statement quoted from Mark 12:28.

because the knowledge of the Day of Judgement is only possessed by God as is shown by Christ's statement above. Christ clearly precludes himself from this knowledge as well as others without any reservations. Had Christ been one of the hypostatic persons of God, this absence of knowledge of the Day of Judgement would not have been conceivable for him, especially keeping in view the belief that the Word and the Son together are the 'knowledge of God', and that the Word, the Son and Christ are united together in one being. If we accept, for a moment, that they are united through incarnation, or through transubstantiation as the Jacobites believe, it would mean that the knowledge of the Day of Judgement would have been possessed by Christ alone¹ or, at least, that the Son must know it as Father does.

Augustine said that Christ negated it to accord with the understanding of the people as if to say that since he could not tell them of the Day of Judgement, for them it was as if he did not know it.

Fourth Statement

In Matthew 20:20-23 we find:

Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's² children with her sons, worshipping him, and desiring a certain thing of him. And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, the other on the left, in thy kingdom. But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask ... but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.

The same event has been described in Mark 10:35-45, but there he speaks of James and John themselves coming to Christ instead of their mother, which presents another example of contradiction of the Biblical text.

1. Because the Christians believe that the attribute of knowledge of God resides in the second person, the son.

2. Zebedee, the father of John and James the Apostles.

In this statement Jesus clearly states that it is not in his power to grant her request and stressed that this power rests with the Father alone. This statement also precludes the Christ from being the second person of the trinity.

Fifth Statement

Matthew 19:16-17 says:

And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master,¹ what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God.

This statement is evidently against the trinity. Jesus did not even like being called 'good' let alone being called God. This statement would be meaningless if Jesus had really been God incarnate. In that case he would have said that there was none good but the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. How can Jesus be supposed to have been pleased with their openly ascribing godhood to him and addressing him as having created man with his own hands?

Sixth Statement

Matthew 27:46 contains:

And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying Eli, Eli, Lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?

Further in verse 50 we find:

Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost.

1. Our author has the word "Righteous" here which is also present in the Arabic version 1865. In the King James version the word 'Good' appears as quoted by us above.

And Luke 23:46 has:

And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said,
Father into thy hands I commend my spirit.

The above statements plainly refute that he was God incarnate. For if he had been God he would have not cried and said, "My God, my God why hast thou forsaken me?" or, "Father I commend my spirit into your hands," etc. because death cannot overcome God, as is evident from the following verses of the sacred books.

God is Immune to Death

Isaiah 40:28 has:

Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding.

Chapter 44:6 of the same book says:

Thus saith the Lord the king of Israel, and his redeemer the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God.

Jeremiah 10:10 has:

But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting king.

Paul's First Epistle to Timothy 1:17 says:

Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever.

God who is eternal, immortal, free of weariness, and everlasting cannot be helpless and subject to death. Can a weak mortal be God? In fact the true God is the One whom, according to the texts quoted above, Christ was addressing at the time of his death. Strangely the

Christians believe that their God, Christ, not only suffered death but also entered into hell after his death.

This belief is reported from the Book of Prayer printed in 1506 in these words:

As Christ died, and was buried for our sake, we must also believe that he descended into Hell.

Philip Guadagnolo wrote a book in Arabic in refutation of the work of Ahmad Al Sharif ibn Zain al-'Abidin and named it *Khiyalatol Filbos* (The views of Philip). It was printed in Rome in 1669. Father Philip said in this book:

Who suffered for our sins, descended into hell, and then was raised from the dead, the third day.

The prayer book contains the word 'hell' in the Athanasian doctrine,¹ firmly believed by all the Christians.

Jawad ibn Sabbath said:

Explaining this belief, Father Martyrose told me that when Christ accepted human form it became necessary for him to bear all human sufferings and afflictions. Therefore he was sent to hell and was punished. When he was delivered from hell, all those who were present in hell before him were released with him. I demanded some proof and support for this belief. He answered that this belief did not need any support. One of the Christians present, sarcastically remarked that the Father must be very cruel, otherwise he would have not allowed his son to go into the fires of hell. The priest became very angry with him and drove him out of the meet-

1. Athanasius, the famous Christian philosopher and theologian (298-373) was the Bishop of Alexandria for a long time. Arianism was in full swing in his time, that is the belief in unitarianism. Athanasius made it the mission of his life to refute Arianism and was exiled and deported five times for his thoughts but at last succeeded in getting Arianism declared a false doctrine. The decision of the Council of Nicaea was also influenced by his teachings. He thought that the Christ was one of the three persons of God. This teaching gained great popularity among the Christians.

ing. Later on the same Christian came to me and embraced Islam but did not allow it to be made public in his lifetime. I promised him to keep it secret.

In 1833 (1248 AH) a renowned priest, Joseph Wolf, came to Lucknow in India. He claimed that he had received inspiration from God. He declared in public that Christ would descend from heaven in 1847. A Shi'ah scholar had a debate with him. The Shi'ah scholar asked him about the belief under discussion and he answered that Christ did indeed enter hell and was punished but there was nothing wrong with this as it was for the redemption of his people.

Some Christian sects hold an even worse belief about Christ. Bell said in his history with regard to the Maronites:

This sect believes that the Christ entered hell after his death and that he delivered the souls of Cain and the people of Sodom from hell, because they were not the followers of the creator of evil, while the souls of Abel, Noah and Abraham remained in hell as they were opponents. They also believe that the creator of the universe is not the God who sent Jesus. They therefore reject the books of the Old Testament as being inspired by God.

The author of *Meezan al Haqq* said in his book *Hall al-Ishkal* which he wrote answering the book *Kashf al-Asrar*:

It is true that the Christian faith includes the belief that Christ entered into hell and came out of it on the third day and ascended to heaven, but the word hell here signifies 'house' that is a place between hell and the highest heaven. This implies that Christ entered the 'House', so that he might show his glory to the people of the 'House' and that he should disclose to them his being master of life, and that he had atoned for all sins by being crucified. Thus hell and Satan were overcome by him, and they were made as if non-existent to the faithful.

It has been confirmed by the Book of Prayer and by the priests,

Philip Guadagnolo, Martyrose and Joseph Wolf that hell is meant here in the real sense, contrary to the interpretation presented by the author of *Meezan al-Haqq*. It remains to be supported by some convincing arguments that any place called 'House' exists between hell and the highest heaven, or that Jesus entered hell simply to show his glory to the people of the 'House'.

Besides, the existence of the 'House' makes no difference since either it is a place of pleasure and comfort or it is a place of punishment and torment. In the former case it would be unnecessary for Christ to show them his glory as they would already be living in eternal pleasure and comfort and in the latter case the 'House' is nothing other than hell for the souls that are suffering there.

Atonement: a Rational Impossibility

The sacrifice of Christ in the form of his death has no logical connection with the belief in atonement, that is the redemption of man from his sins. As sin in this context is the original sin that was committed by Adam in Paradise. It is logically inconceivable that all of a man's progeny should suffer for the sin of their father. It would be a great injustice to them. It is clearly said in the book of Ezekiel 18:20:

The Son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son, the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.

The other point that we are unable to understand is that Satan was overcome by Christ through his death. According to the books of the Christians Satan is eternally chained and imprisoned from the time prior to the birth of Christ. The sixth verse of the Epistle of Jude has:

And the angels, which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgement of the great day.

Seventh Statement

The Gospel of John contains the following statement of Christ addressing Mary:¹

Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and my God, and your God.²

Christ, in this statement, describes himself as man like others so that the people may not accuse him of the claim of self-deification. He stressed his humanity and said that he is a man like others, the word son has been used for him only in metaphorical sense. As this statement was made by him before his ascension to the heavens and just after his 'resurrection' it confirms that Christ had been preaching his humanity and his being the servant of God up to his ascension to the heavens, that is, the whole of his life. The above statement of Christ is absolutely in accordance with the following statement of the Holy Qur'an where it quotes the statement of the Prophet Jesus (peace be on him).

I spoke to them of nothing except what you bade me. (I said) worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord.³

Eighth Statement

The Gospel of John 14:28, contains the following statement of Christ:

For my Father is greater than I.

1. Mary Magdalene, repeatedly discussed early in this book. According to the Gospel of John, she came to the grave of Christ after his burial. She found the grave empty and Christ appeared to her and made the above statement to her, and ascended to heaven.

2. John 20:17.

3. The Holy Qur'an 5:117: the translation of the verse has been quoted from *The Meaning of the Qur'an*, English translation printed in Beirut, Lebanon.

This also confirms that Christ denied being God, as no one can be even equal to God far from being greater than Him.

Ninth Statement

The Gospel of John 14:24 contains the following statement of Christ:

And the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me.

This makes it very clear that the word spoken by Christ is the word of God and not the word of Jesus, and that Jesus was no more than a messenger sent by God.

Tenth Statement

Matthew chapter 23 contains this address of Christ to his disciples:

And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ.¹

This also clearly says that God is one and Jesus only his messenger.

Eleventh Statement

The Gospel of Matthew 26:36-44 has:

Then cometh Jesus with them unto a place called Gethsemane, and saith unto the disciples, Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder. And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee,² and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here and watch with me. And he

1. Matt. 9-10.

2. That is, James and John.

went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup¹ pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt. And he cometh unto the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto Peter. What, could ye not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak. He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done; And he came and found them asleep again.... And he went away again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words.

All the sayings and the acts of Christ in the above description clearly prove that Christ did not consider himself to be God, but a servant of God. Would God be sorrowful to death, would God prostrate and pray as Christ did? Besides, when the only purpose of Christ's coming in the world in human form was to sacrifice his life for the redemption of the whole world, why, on this very occasion, was he so sorrowful on the question of his death which was supposedly the very purpose of his existence? Why did he pray that God would remove the cup of death from him?

Twelfth Statement

It was the usual habit of Christ to refer to himself with the words 'the son of man' as is evident from Matthew, 8:20, 9:6, 6:13, 27, 17:9, 12, 22. 18:11. 19:28. 20:18, 28. 24:27. 26:24, 45, 64. Similarly there are many other places in other books.

Christian Arguments in favour of the Trinity

It has been shown under the fifth point above that the writings of John are full of metaphorical and symbolical descriptions and that there are only rare occasions where some interpretation is not required. Similarly we have shown in the sixth point that great ambiguity is found in Christ's statements, to the extent, in fact, that even

1. That is, the cup of death.

his disciples were unable to understand him until Christ himself had specified the meaning of his statements. Also we have cited examples proving that he never claimed godhood nor to be the second person of the trinity in clear words; and that the statements usually used by the Christians to support this claim are ambiguous and mostly taken from the Gospel of John.

These statements are of three kinds:

1. There are some statements that do not in any way support their claim as far as their real meanings are concerned. Their deductions from these statements stand in clear contradiction to reason as well as textual evidence and explicit statements of Christ himself. We have sufficiently discussed them in the previous two sections.
2. Some statements produced by them for this purpose are of the kind that have already been explained by other verses of the Gospels and by statements made by Christ himself. In the presence of these explanations, no other explanations of the Christian scholars or commentators can be accepted.
3. There are statements that, according to Christian theologians require interpretation. The necessity of interpretation in such statements requires that this interpretation must not contradict the holy text and be consistent with rational arguments. It is unnecessary to reproduce all those statements here and we will reproduce and discuss only some of them in order to exhibit the nature of their argumentation.

First Argument

The verses frequently quoted by Christian scholars are those that refer to Christ as the son of God.¹ These verses as an argument for Christ's divinity are not valid, firstly because they are contradictory to other verses that speak of Christ as the son of man,² and because these

1. See Matthew 26:63, and 3:17, and John 4:9. for instance.

2. There are sixty verses in the Gospels where Christ is referred to as the son of man.

verses also preclude Christ from being a descendant of David.¹ Therefore they need some interpretation to prevent them from being a logical impossibility. Secondly, because the word 'Son' cannot be taken in its literal and real sense, as all the experts in etymology unanimously describe its meaning as "the one born of the natural sperm of his father and mother." This literal meaning of the word is clearly not applicable here. Therefore, it requires that it should be used metaphorically in such a meaning as may be appropriate to the status of Christ. Especially when the Gospels elucidate that this word is used in the meaning of 'righteous' when referring to Christ. The Gospel of Mark 15:39 says:

And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God.

While the Gospel of Luke describes the same event in these words:

Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man.²

It may be noted that Luke uses the words 'righteous man' in place of Mark's words 'the son of God'. This expression has been used to signify 'righteous man' by other people as well, exactly as 'the son of Satan' has been used to mean an evil-doer. The Gospel of Matthew says in chapter five:

Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.³

It may be noted that Jesus himself used the words 'children of God' for the peacemakers. Moreover chapter 8 of the Gospel of John contains a dialogue between Christ and the Jews in which Christ says:

1. Matthew 1:1, 9:27, 21:9, and Luke 1 and 32 refer to him as the son of David.

2. Luke 23:47.

3. Matt.5:9

Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God. Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me.¹

Further in verse 44 he says:

Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar, and the father of it.

The Jews in this example claimed that their father was one, that is God, while Jesus said that their father was the devil. It is obvious that neither God nor devils can be father of any in the literal sense of the word. It is therefore, necessary for these words to be taken in a metaphorical sense, that is to say, the Jews were claiming to be obedient to God while Jesus said that they were followers of the devil.

The First Epistle of John 3:9,10 contains this statement:

Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.

We read in chapter 5:1 of the same epistle:

Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him. By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments.²

Another statement we read in Romans 8:14:

For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

1. John 8:41,42.

2. I John 5:1-2.

Also Paul says in Philippians 2:14,15:

Do all things without murmurings and disputings: That ye be blameless and harmless, the sons of God.

All the above statements sufficiently prove our claim that the words 'Son of God' used for Christ in some statements does not prove that Christ was the Son of God in the real sense of the word. Especially when we find the words Father and Son used in metaphorical sense frequently in both the Old and New Testaments. We present some examples of such use from the Bible.

"Son of God" Used In The Bible

Luke, describing the genealogy of Christ says in chapter 3:

The son of Joseph...and Adam which was the son of God.

Obviously Adam was not the Son of God in the literal sense. Since he was created by God without biological parents, metaphorically he has been ascribed to God. Luke ascribes Jesus to Joseph although Jesus had no biological father, as he relates Adam, who had no biological parents with God.

Exodus 4:22 contains the following statement of God:

And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my firstborn: And I say unto thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me: and if thou refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay thy son, even thy firstborn.

Here this idea is used twice in connection with Israel, who is even referred to by God as his 'firstborn'.

Psalms 89:19-27 contains the following address of David to God:

Then thou spakest in vision to thy holy one, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people. I have found David my servant; with my holy oil, have I anointed him He shall cry unto

me, Thou art my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth.

In this example David is spoken of as being mighty, the chosen, the anointed by God, and the firstborn of God, while the word father has been used for God.

Jeremiah 31:9 contains this statement of God:

For I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim¹ is my firstborn.

Here Ephraim is referred to by God as his firstborn.

If such use of words are an argument for being God then David, Israel and Ephraim also must be gods even of higher status than Christ, for, the firstborn deserves more respect than his younger brother. If they contend that Christ is the "only begotten of the father," we will be very glad to hear this since it would mean that these words must have been able to be used metaphorically.

II Samuel in chapter 7 verse 14 has:

I will be his father, and he shall be my son.

This is God's statement in favour of the prophet Solomon.

The words 'Sons of God' have been used for all the Israelites in Deuteronomy 32:19, 14;1, Isaiah 63:8, and Hosea 1:10. In Isaiah 63:16, we find the following address of Isaiah to God:

Doubtless thou art our father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O Lord, art our father, our redeemer; thy name is from everlasting.

Further in 64:8 of this book, we read:

But now, O Lord, thou art our father.

Isaiah here addresses God as being the father of all the Israelites.

1. Ephraim was the younger son of the prophet Joseph (Peace be on him)

Job 38:7 says:

When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?

Psalms 68:5 has:

A father of the fatherless, and a judge of the widows, is God in his holy habitation.

Genesis 6:1-2 contains:

When men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.

Further in verse 4 it says:

There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them.

In this example, the sons of God are the noble sons, and daughters of men are the daughters of the common people. The Arabic translator of 1811 translated the first verse with the words, 'the sons of the nobles', instead of 'the sons of God'. This allows us to understand that the word 'God' may be used metaphorically for noble.

There are many places in the Gospels where the expression 'your father' has been used for God addressing the disciples and others. For instance we find, "That ye may be the children of your father," in Matthew 5:45. Also see Matthew 5:16 and 5:48, Luke 12:30 and 11:2, and John 17:20 for other similar examples.

Sometimes the words 'father' and 'son' are used to stress and emphasize their association with other things, like the expression 'father of the lie', 'sons of hell' and 'sons of Jerusalem' used by Christ for the Jews in Matthew chapter 23. Similarly 'sons of God' and 'sons of the Day of Judgement' are used for the residents of

Paradise.

Second Argument

The Gospel of John 8:23 contains this statement:

And he said unto them, Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world.

From this statement of Christ, the Christians deduced that he was God who, having descended from heaven, appeared in human form.

The above contention and deduction of the Christian scholars is wrong for two reasons: firstly, because it is again clearly against all textual and rational evidence and, secondly, because similar statements of Christ are found referring to his disciples. He said in John 15:19:

If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.

Again in John 17:14 Christ has said about his disciples:

Because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.

Christ declared that his disciples were not of this world exactly as he had said of himself, "I am from above." Now if his statement is taken in its literal sense as proof of his godhood, it would logically mean that all his disciples too, were gods. The only logical interpretation of his statement is, "You are desirous of this mundane world while I am not, rather I seek the pleasure of Allah and eternal life in the Hereafter."

Third Argument

John 10:30 has:

I and my Father are one.

This verse is said to prove the unity of Christ and God. This contention is also wrong for two reasons. Firstly, the Christians agree that Christ was a man like other human beings having a body and a soul. The unity between the physical body of a man and God is impossible. Therefore they would essentially have to say that, as Christ is the perfect man, he is also the perfect God. According to the first assumption he would have accidental existence and according to the other he is proved to be non-human, both contentions are therefore rationally impossible.

Secondly, similar expressions have been used by Christ about his disciples. He is reported to have said in John 17:21:

That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

Here Christ's expression that 'they may be one' obviously cannot be taken to prove that the disciples, Christ and God can be united in a literal sense. As their unity in a literal sense is not rationally possible, similarly Christ's unity with God, simply on the ground of such expressions, is not possible. In fact, the expressions talking of unity, mean to be obedient to God's commandments, and to be righteous in one's deeds. In this sense they are all united, with the difference that Christ's unity with God in this sense is more perfect than that of his disciples. This interpretation is in fact confirmed by John, the apostle. He says in I John 1:5-7:

This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth; But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another.

In Persian translations the last sentence appears as "we are united with one another." This obviously supports our view that unity here means exactly what we have described above.

Fourth Argument

The Gospel of John 14:9,10 says:

He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.

Christ's expression, "I am in the father and the Father in me," is supposed to prove that the Christ and God are one in a real sense. This argument is not acceptable again for two reasons. Firstly, the Christians agree that the visibility of God in this world is rationally impossible, as we have discussed in our fourth point above. They usually interpret it in the sense of recognition and awareness of God, but since this does not indicate unity between God and Christ, they interpret it as being united in spiritual sense. But it is essential for an interpretation that it must not be in contradiction with reason and textual evidence.

Secondly, in John 14:20 we read:

That I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.

This is similar to the statement we discussed in the third argument above. It is obvious that if A is in B, and B is united with C, this requires that A also should be united with C. Besides we read in I Corinthians 6:19:

What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?

We find a similar statement in II Corinthians 6:16:

And what argument hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God.

And it is said in Ephesians 4:6:

One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

If this association necessarily proves unity between them in a real sense, it would mean that all the Corinthians and Ephesians were also God.

What all the above statements show that this unity and association is in fact, for his obedience and his love. We read the following in the First Epistle of John:

And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.¹

Fifth Argument: The Miracles

The miracles performed by Jesus are also supposed to prove his divinity. This argument is as ridiculous as the others. The greatest of all the miracles performed by Jesus was raising some people from the dead. There are only three people said to have been raised from the dead by Christ whereas we understand from chapter 37 of Ezekiel that Ezekiel revived thousands of men from the dead. Therefore he should deserve godhood more than Christ does. Besides, we read in chapter 17 of I Kings² that Elijah also revived a dead man. A similar event is described in II Kings chapter 4 where Elijah is also described as having revived a dead man. The same miracle was performed by Elisha, even after his death, as is understood from II Kings chapter 13 where a dead man was put into his grave and revived by the grace of God.

Even if we assume that some of Christ's statements can serve the purpose of supporting Christian argument for the trinity, this is still

1. 3:24.

2. I Kings 17:2-21. Here Elijah is described as being a guest of a woman whose son died of sickness. Elijah prayed to God and the son was made alive again.

not acceptable in the presence of the fact that much of the text is not inspired, has undergone a great many distortions, and contains many errors and fallacies as we have proved beyond doubt already in this book. As for Paul's statements, they are not acceptable to us because he was not a disciple of Jesus. It may be noted here that all the things said above were only to show the obviously imbecilic nature of their argumentation, otherwise, as we have already proved with specific examples, the books themselves are unacceptable to us, in any case, because of the distortions, alterations and manipulations that are found in them. Similarly we have quoted the statements of the disciples, assuming for their sake that they are really the statements of the disciples, otherwise they are equally unauthenticated and of dubious nature.

I must express the belief of the Muslims in this regard that Jesus and his disciples were free and pure of any polluted thought and we bear witness that there is no God but Allah, and Muhammad was His Messenger and servant. Similarly the Prophet Jesus was a Messenger and servant of Allah, and the disciples were his companions deputed by him.

A Debate between Imam Raazi and a Priest

Imam Raazi had a debate on the question of the trinity with a priest. He reported it in his commentary on the Holy Qur'an under the comments on 3:61:

When I was in Khwarazim, I was told that a Christian had come there who claimed to have deep knowledge of Christianity. I went to him and a debate started between us. He demanded proof of the prophethood of Muhammad. I said that we have received authentic reports with regard to the miracles performed by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace and blessings be upon him, just like the reports we have received with regard to the miracles performed by the Prophets Musa (Moses) and Isa (Jesus) peace be on them. Now if we deny the authentic reports, or we accept them but deny the fact that miracles prove the truth of the prophets, this

would necessarily deny the prophethood of all the Prophets of Allah. On the other hand if we accept the truth of the reports and also believe that miracles are sure signs of the truth of the Prophets, and both of these arguments are proved to be true for the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the truth of his prophethood would be essentially proved.

The priest answered that he did not claim that Christ was a Prophet but believed him to be God. I told him that first we should have the definition of God. We all know that God must be self-existent, the first and prime cause, and beyond physical description. However, we find that Jesus had a human form, was born, and did not exist before, and then was apparently killed by the Jews. In the beginning he was a child and gradually grew into a youth. He needed food to live and used to eat and drink, and had all the characteristics of a human being. It is obvious that an accidental being cannot be self-existent, and one who is subject to change cannot be eternal and everlasting.

Secondly, your claim is wrong on the ground that you say that Jesus was arrested by the Jews and then was crucified. He also made every effort to run away in order to save himself. He tried to hide himself before his arrest and then, before his death, he cried aloud. Now if he was God, or a part of God that was united with the God-head or God was in him, why could he not save himself from this persecution, and punish them for such a sacrilegious act. His weeping and crying, and making efforts to hide himself, is just as inconceivable. We are really surprised at how a man with ordinary commonsense could ever believe something which is so evidently irrational and contrary to human reason?

Thirdly, your hypothesis is impossible because we must agree with one of three logical possibilities in this matter. Either God was the same Christ who was visible to the people in human form, or God was fully united with him or some part of God was united to him. All three possibilities are equally irrational and logically impossible.

The first because if the creator of the universe was Jesus, it would require that the God of the universe was crucified by the Jews, in this case the existence of this universe would

have ceased. The God of the universe being killed by the Jews, who are the most inconsidered and disregarded nation of the world, is all the more ironical and unimaginable. He must be a most helpless God indeed!

The second possibility is also unacceptable, because if God is neither a body nor an essence, his presence and unification with form and body is rationally not possible. And if God has a form and is material, its unity with other substances would mean that the particles of God's matter are separate from one another; if he is an essence, this would necessitate some other matter for its existence, which would imply that God was dependent on something outside Himself for his existence.

The third possibility that some parts of God were united with him is also absurd because if those parts were vital for God, it would require that God would have been without some of his vital parts after they were united with Jesus, and God would no longer be perfect. If those parts were not vital and God would lose nothing without them, such parts could not be parts of God.

The fourth argument, refuting this Christian claim, is that it has been proved that the Christ had extraordinary liking for worship and for obedience to God. Had he been God Himself he would have not been involved in the worship of God. As God is not required to worship himself.

I asked the priest what arguments he had for his claim for the divinity of Christ. He answered that he performed great miracles like reviving the dead and healing lepers. These miraculous achievements are not possible without divine powers. I asked him if he agreed that the absence of a predicate did not necessarily prove the absence of the existence of the subject. If you do not agree with it, it would demand that in the beginning when this universe did not exist, God also did not exist.

On the other hand, if you agree that the absence of a predicate does not necessarily prove the absence of the subject, I will ask you a question. How do you know that God is not united with me, with you or with any living creature as He was united with Christ? He answered that it was obvious that

Christ performed miracles and wonders, while such wonders are not performed by any of us. This was enough indication that God was not united with us.

I said to him that this showed that he did not understand the premise that the absence of a predicate did not prove the absence of the subject, because if the performance of miracles is a predicate of God's union with Christ, the only thing absent in our case, is the performance of miracles but this absence of a predicate does not prove that God is not united with us or with other animals. I added, that any faith which requires us to believe that God can be united with animals cannot be acceptable to any sensible man.

Moreover, Moses miraculously turned his staff into a serpent. Logically speaking, making a wood into a living serpent is greater marvel than the revival of a dead man. Because the difference between a living man and a dead man is not as great as between a wood and a living serpent. Now if Moses did not become God by performing this wonder how could a lesser wonder be an argument for Jesus being God or the Son of God? The Priest was spell-bound and gave up the discussion.